

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

***GRATON RANCHERIA CASINO AND HOTEL
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT***

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

GRATON RANCHERIA CASINO AND HOTEL – DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

ES.1 INTRODUCTION

This Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was prepared to assess the environmental consequences of the National Indian Gaming Commission's (NIGC) approval of a 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 seven alternatives, including an alternative use and a No Action alternative, are analyzed within this DEIS.

ES.2 PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose and need for approving the 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 six 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, and F require the proposed action of approval of a management contract. Alternatives E and G do not require the approval of a management contract.

ES.3.1 ALTERNATIVE A – PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed Action consists of the NIGC's approval of a 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**.

ES.3.2 ALTERNATIVE B – NORTHWEST STONY POINT CASINO

The Proposed Action consists of the NIGC's approval of a management contract between the Tribe and SC Sonoma Management, LLC. 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.

ES.3.3 ALTERNATIVE C – NORTHEAST STONY POINT CASINO

Under Alternative C, the components of the casino/hotel resort would be identical to Alternative A. 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.

ES.3.4 ALTERNATIVE D – REDUCED INTENSITY

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 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 an off-site location. 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.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 following is a summary of the common areas of controversy raised in the scoping process. 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 EPA'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 the 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 Safety Department and Sheriff. Commenters inquired as to the size and training of any Tribal police force.

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

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 Wilfred Site commercial/residential development. As a result, Alternative D would have similar traffic impacts as Alternative A and 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. As noted in Section 2, analysis for an eighth alternative (Alternative H) is currently ongoing (and will be included in full in the Final EIS). 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-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 on 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%.

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 effects 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 is contained in **Section 4.7**. However, of course, 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). The socioeconomic effects of Alternative H are expected to be similar to those of Alternative D given that they would be similarly sized and located in similar locations.

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			
<i>Topography</i>			
<p>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.</p>	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
<p>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.</p>			
<p>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.</p>	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
<p>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 B or its surrounding areas due to instability of slopes or</p>			

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
landslides is low.			
<p>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.</p>	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
<p>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.</p>			
<p>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.</p>	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
<p>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.</p>	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
<p>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 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</p>	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
<p>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.</p> <p>Existing slopes within the Lakeville site are not considered steep enough to present an unstable condition.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Landslide-related impacts for Alternative G would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
<p>Soil</p> <p>A The development of Alternative A may result in exposure of overlying facilities to corrosive soil.</p> <p>The development of Alternative A may result in structural damage to overlying facilities by expansion and subsidence of soils.</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	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
<p>B The development of Alternative B may result in exposure of overlying facilities to corrosive soils.</p> <p>The development of Alternative B may result in exposure of overlying facilities to structural damage due to expansive soils and subsidence.</p>	S	<p>deeper).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Removal and replacement of non-expansive soils b. Lime treatment of soils c. Design of pavement sections to withstand potential swelling pressures. <p>Same as A.</p>	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
<p>C The development of Alternative C may result in exposure of overlying facilities to corrosive soils.</p> <p>The development of Alternative C may result in exposure of overlying facilities to structural damage due to expansive soils and subsidence.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>D The development of Alternative D may result in exposure of overlying facilities to corrosive soils.</p> <p>The development of Alternative D may result in exposure of overlying facilities to structural damage due to expansive soils and subsidence.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>E The development of Alternative E may result in exposure of overlying facilities to corrosive soils.</p> <p>The development of Alternative E may result in exposure of overlying facilities to structural damage due to expansive soils and subsidence.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>F The development of Alternative F may result in exposure of overlying facilities to corrosive soils.</p> <p>The development of Alternative F may result in structural damage to overlying facilities by expansion and subsidence of soils.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>G The development of Alternative G may result in exposure of overlying facilities to corrosive soils.</p>	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
<p>The development of Alternative G may result in exposure of overlying facilities to structural damage due to expansive soils and subsidence.</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of facilities will adhere to the Uniform Building Code. Specifically, Chapter 16 of the 1997 UBC addresses 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. 	LTS
Seismicity			
<p>A Alternative A may potentially be exposed to the seismic hazards liquefaction and regional faulting.</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of facilities will adhere to the Uniform Building Code. Specifically, Chapter 16 of the 1997 UBC addresses 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. 	LTS
<p>B Alternative B may potentially be exposed to the seismic hazards liquefaction and regional flooding.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>C Alternative C may potentially be exposed to the seismic hazards liquefaction and regional flooding.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>D Alternative D may potentially be exposed to the seismic hazards</p>	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
liquefaction and regional flooding.			
E Alternative E may potentially be exposed to the seismic hazards liquefaction and regional flooding.	S	Same as A.	LTS
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
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

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
<p>4.3 WATER RESOURCES</p> <p><i>Surface Water</i></p> <p>A</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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. 	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
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Hacienda Bridge, or as otherwise specified in the NPDES permit. • Effluent shall be stored in tanks and holding ponds or 	

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
		<p>discharged to land during the May 14 through September 30 prohibitory discharge period, or during any other period specified in the NPDES permit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
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 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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 ensure stormwater runoff is reduced to pre-project levels. 	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
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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. 	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
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 program preceded by a pump test (see Appendix G) 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). 	
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

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 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
4.4 AIR QUALITY			
<i>Construction Related Emissions</i>			
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.	LTS	<p data-bbox="1110 784 1776 1068">A. The generation of construction-related PM₁₀ emissions has been identified as a less-than-significant impact. However, implementation of Basic Control Measures and Enhanced Control Measures from Table 2 of the <i>BAAQMD California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines - Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans</i> (Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), 1999) is recommended during the construction of any of the project alternatives.</p> <p data-bbox="1167 1101 1776 1222">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.</p> <p data-bbox="1167 1255 1776 1336">b. Basic Control Measures include the following:</p> <p data-bbox="1209 1312 1776 1336">i. Water all active construction areas at least twice</p>	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
		<p>daily.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard. iii. Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on 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. <p>c. Enhanced Control Measures include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. iv. Install sandbags or other erosion control 	

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
		<p align="center">measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.</p> <p>v. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>a. To the extent that equipment and technology is available and cost effective, the contractor shall use catalyst and filtration technologies</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 AQCM that such engine is not available for a particular use. In the event that a Tier II engine is not available, Tier I compliant or 1996 or newer engines will be used preferentially. Older engines will only be used if the</p>	

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
		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
F Similar to C.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
G Similar to C.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
Asbestos Impacts			

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
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	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
<p>F Alternative F would not result in demolition activity, therefore there are no impacts related to asbestos.</p> <p>Alternative F is not located in an area of Naturally Occurring Asbestos, therefore a less than significant impact from NOA would occur.</p>	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
G Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
Operational Related Emissions			
<p>A ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ emissions associated with operation of Alternative A could be reduced, but not to a less-than-significant</p>	S	A. The Tribe shall provide:	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
<p>level.</p> <p>Alternative A exceeds the <i>de minimis</i> conformity thresholds for NO_x and CO. Therefore a conformity determination is required.</p> <p>Alternative A is not considered to have the potential for resulting in a significant CO air quality impact.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Community transit or shuttle service, b. Transit shelter benches, c. Street lighting, d. Route signs and display, and e. Bus turnouts. B. The Tribe will implement feasible travel demand management (TDM) measures for a project of this type. This would include but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 for employees and patrons of gaming facility. g. Diesel buses shall comply with CARB'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 restricts idling times to 5 minutes at any location, excluding passenger loading and unloading. h. The Tribe shall encourage and facilitate the use of 	

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
		<p>'carpools' by construction and facility staff and tour buses for casino patrons.</p> <p>i. The Tribe shall ensure that buildings are oriented to take advantage of solar heating and natural cooling, and use passive solar designs</p> <p>j. The Tribe will ensure use of solar, low-emission, central, or tankless water heaters and install wall insulation that meets or exceeds Title 24 requirements.</p> <p>k. A parking structure is proposed in Alternatives A, B, C, D, and F. If mechanical ventilation is included in the parking structure design, the exhaust should be vented in a direction away from inhabited areas. Directing the exhaust away from inhabited areas would reduce the impacts of parking structure-generated CO from Alternatives A, B, C, D, and F to a less than significant level.</p> <p>This natural dispersal of CO should be directed away from the sensitive receptors by partially enclosing the parking structure and installing a mechanical ventilation system. Directing the dispersal of CO away from nearby sensitive receptors would be accomplished by focusing the enclosure on the east side of the parking structure, and by directing the ventilation system exhaust vertically and away from inhabited areas.</p> <p>L. The Tribe shall ensure that all shift changes occur</p>	

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
<p>B ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ emissions associated with operation of Alternative B could be reduced, but not to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Alternative B exceeds the <i>de minimis</i> conformity thresholds for NO_x and CO. Therefore a conformity determination is required.</p> <p>Alternative B is not considered to have the potential for resulting in a significant CO air quality impact.</p>	S	<p>during non-peak hours.</p> <p>M The Tribe shall purchase offset credits for VOCs, PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ so that the total direct and indirect emissions of the project is less than or equal to the BAAQMD significance thresholds stated in Section 4.4. It should be noted that NO_x emissions will be mitigated to zero through the conformity process.</p> <p>Same as A.</p>	LTS
<p>C ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ emissions associated with operation of Alternative C could be reduced, but not to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Alternative C exceeds the <i>de minimis</i> conformity thresholds for NO_x and CO. Therefore a conformity determination is required.</p> <p>Alternative C is not considered to have the potential for resulting in a significant CO air quality impact.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>D ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ emissions associated with operation of Alternative D could be reduced, but not to a less-than-significant</p>	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
<p>level.</p> <p>Alternative D exceeds the <i>de minimis</i> conformity thresholds for NO_x and CO. Therefore a conformity determination is required.</p> <p>Alternative D is not considered to have the potential for resulting in a significant CO air quality impact.</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>The Tribe will ensure that setback distance is minimized between development and existing/designated transit/pedestrian shelters</p>	LTS
<p>E ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ emissions would be associated with operation of Alternative E.</p> <p>Alternative E is not considered to have the potential for resulting in a significant CO air quality impact.</p>	LTS	<p>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.</p> <p>The Tribe will ensure that setback distance is minimized between development and existing/designated transit/pedestrian shelters</p>	LTS
<p>F ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ emissions associated with operation of Alternative F could be reduced, but not to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Alternative F exceeds the <i>de minimis</i> conformity thresholds for NO_x. Therefore a conformity determination is required.</p> <p>Alternative F is not considered to have the potential for resulting in a significant CO air quality impact.</p>	S	<p>Same as A.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Conformity Determination will be conducted for emissions of NO_x and CO that exceed <i>de minimis</i> levels. 	LTS
<p>G ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ emissions associated with operation of Alternative B could be reduced, but not to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>Alternative B is not considered to have the potential for resulting in</p>	S	<p>C. The developer will implement feasible travel demand management (TDM) measures for a project of this type. This would include but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designation of an on-site TDM coordinator. 	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
a significant CO air quality impact.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provisions to encourage bicycle commuting. • Provision of transit use incentives, provision of information, printed schedules and commuter promotions. • Carpool incentives. • Installation of secure bicycle parking facilities at commercial areas and parks. • The developer 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 developer will ensure that setback distance is minimized between development and existing/designated transit/pedestrian shelters. • The developer shall ensure that buildings are oriented to take advantage of solar heating and natural cooling, and use passive solar designs. 	
Odor Impacts			
<p>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.</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To avoid/reduce potential adverse odor effects associated with potential wastewater treatment and disposal facility, the Tribe shall implement the following measures for Alternatives B, C, D, E, and F and Alternative A, if the onsite wastewater treatment option is chosen: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The wastewater treatment plant shall be 	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
		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.	
		b. Spray drift from the wastewater treatment plant or spray disposal field shall not be allowed to migrate out of the plant's property boundaries.	
		c. Spray field irrigation will cease when winds exceed 30 mph.	
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior to issuance of building permits within the Project area, 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
Toxic Air Contaminant Impacts			

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
<p>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.</p>	S	<p>A. To avoid/reduce potential adverse toxic air contaminant effects associated with this facility, the Tribe shall ensure the following measures are included in the design and operation of the project for Alternatives A, B, C, D, E, and F:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 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. b. Air intakes associated with the heating and cooling system for buildings shall not be located next to potential TAC-emitting locations (e.g., loading docks) in accordance with ARB's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook. 	LTS
B Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
C Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
D Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>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.</p> <p>Alternative E has the potential to locate dry cleaning facilities and/or gasoline stations among its proposed commercial/retail land</p>	S	<p>A. Same as A , as well as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Tribe shall provide an adequate buffer between any dry cleaning operation and any sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, households, etc.). b. The Tribe shall provide an adequate buffer between 	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
uses. Air quality studies indicate that there is still the potential for substantial risks even near well-controlled dry cleaners (CARB 2005d).		any gasoline dispensing facility and any sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, households, etc.).	
Alternative E also has the potential to locate gasoline-dispensing facilities. Refueling at gasoline dispensing facilities releases benzene into the air.			
F Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
G Similar to E.	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as A, as well as the developer shall implement the following measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. The developer shall provide an adequate buffer between any dry cleaning operation and any sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, households, etc.). 	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

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.	NE	Same as A.	NE
E Similar to A.	NE	Same as A.	NE
F Similar to A.	NE	Same as A.	NE
G Similar to A.	NE	Same as A.	NE
Indoor Air Quality Impacts			
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following measures are recommended for Alternatives A, B, C, D, E, and F: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Tribe shall ensure that ventilation of outdoor air is consistent with ASHRAE Standard 62-1999 under all operating conditions. b. To limit public exposure to environmental tobacco smoke, the Tribe will provide non-smoking areas, or “smoke-free zones” in the casino gaming area. c. The Tribe shall ensure that comfort levels are acceptable to most occupants, and consistent with ASHRAE Standard 55-1992, under all operating conditions. d. The Tribe shall ensure that significant expected sources of pollutant emissions are isolated from occupants using physical barriers, exhausts, and pressure controls. 	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
		<p>e. 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.</p> <p>f. The Tribe shall ensure that provisions are made for easy access to HVAC equipment requiring periodic maintenance.</p> <p>g. 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.</p> <p>h. The Tribe shall ensure the use of low-emitting building products pursuant to Integrated Waste Management Board's Section 01350 where feasible.</p>	
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

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
<p>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.</p> <p>Ventilation is a standard engineering approach to assuring good indoor air quality and comfort. However, ventilation is not a complete solution to indoor pollution.</p>	LTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following measures are recommended for Alternative G: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The developer shall ensure that ventilation of outdoor air is consistent with ASHRAE Standard 62-1999 under all operating conditions. j. The developer shall ensure that comfort levels are acceptable to most occupants, and consistent with ASHRAE Standard 55-1992, under all operating conditions. k. The developer shall ensure that significant expected sources of pollutant emissions are isolated from occupants using physical barriers, exhausts, and pressure controls. l. 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. m. The developer shall ensure that provisions are made for easy access to HVAC equipment requiring periodic maintenance. n. 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. o. The developer shall ensure the use of low- 	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
<p>4.5 BIOLOGY</p> <p><i>Potential Effects to Wildlife and Habitats</i></p> <p>A Development of Alternative A would affect habitats that are utilized by wildlife species including federally listed species, species of concern, and migratory birds.</p>	S	<p>emitting building products pursuant to Integrated Waste Management Board's Section 01350 where feasible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A detailed plan shall be developed and implemented to conserve ecological resources in the 182 acres in the 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. Mitigation for rare plant impacts 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. Mitigation for impacts to approximately 75 acres of breeding/aestivation habitat for CTS should be developed in coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) as part of required consultation under Section 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
		<p>of the federal Endangered Species Act. Mitigation shall include avoidance of habitat; 3:1 mitigation of the impacted acreage, which is managed to protect CTS resources; potential increased aestivation habitat through cessation of farming activities; and creation of new breeding habitat within created seasonal wetlands (considering concurrent loss of aestivation habitat through this activity). Mitigation plans shall also include relocation of CTS from development areas (including locations of created wetlands) and use of biological monitors during construction or excavation activities. Purchase of credits at an offsite mitigation bank may be implemented if determined to be appropriate by USFWS during the Section 7 consultation process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 nest sites are found, passive relocation measures that include the creation of two natural or artificial burrows shall be provided for each burrow in the area of the Wilfred site that will be 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 	

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
		<p>Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation" (CDFG, 1995).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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 	

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
		<p>(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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hazardous materials including fuels, oils, solvents, ect., 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 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, nitrates, and endocrine wastes, should occur to the extent technically feasible during spring discharge from March 20 to May 15 each year. This mitigation will reduce the effects of wastewater discharge on Threatened and Endangered Species of fish, and reduce the levels of biostimulatory substances in tertiary-treated wastewater to less than significant during the critical spring months. In 	

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	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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 	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
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systematic plant surveys of the project site should be conducted during the early spring flowering period to document presence or absence of early blooming species. • 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 • Pre-construction surveys for burrowing owls must be completed to ensure that this species is not present in the construction area. Pre-construction surveys must be completed 30 days prior to the initiation of construction activity. The presence of nests of this species would require the delay of construction until after the young have fledged. • 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 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. 	

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
<p>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.</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Same as A.</p>	LTS
<p>Potential Effects to Waters of the U.S.</p>			
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 on-site and/or within an open space preserve. This creation/restoration will provide an increase in the inventory of seasonal wetlands for the area. The scale of seasonal wetland 	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 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.	S	Same as A.	LTS
Development of Alternative B Option 2 would impact 26.43 acres of 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.	S	Same as A.	LTS
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.			

restoration (proposed 2:1 ratio) will be sufficient to satisfy the ratio of replacement acreage 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.

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
<p>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.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>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.</p>			
<p>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.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>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.</p>			
<p>F Development of Alternative F Option 1 would impact 98.65 acres of wetlands, for a total of 98.65 acres of waters of the U.S.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>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.</p>			
<p>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.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>4.6 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES</p>			
<p>A Development proposed under this alternative may adversely effect previously unknown subsurface prehistoric or historic</p>	S	<p>A. The Tribe will implement all mitigation measures concurred upon by the State Historic Preservation</p>	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
archaeological resources. This is a potentially significant impact.		<p>Officer (SHPO) during the Section 106 consultation process, including but not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The following mitigation shall be conducted and the Section 106 process concluded prior to any ground- disturbing activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Alternatives B, D, and E: Section 106 concurrence of <i>no historic properties are effected</i> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	

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 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	S	Same as A.	LTS

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 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, no further disturbance shall occur until the Tribe and County Coroner 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 Tribe shall make necessary arrangements regarding the disposition of the remains.

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
<p>purposes. Development proposed under this alternative may also adversely effect previously unknown subsurface prehistoric, historic and paleontological archaeological resources.</p>			
<p>C Development proposed under this alternative may adversely affect previously unknown subsurface prehistoric or historic archaeological resources. This is a potentially significant impact.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>D Development proposed under Alternative D would be similar to impacts described under Alternative B. This is a potentially significant impact. .</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>E Development proposed under Alternative E would be similar to impacts described under Alternative B. This is a potentially significant impact.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>F Development proposed under this alternative may adversely effect previously unknown subsurface prehistoric or historic archaeological resources. This is a potentially significant impact.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>G Similar to A.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>4.7 SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS</p>			
<p><i>Direct Economic Effects</i></p>			
<p><i>Construction</i></p>			

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 129 employees would be required to construct Alternative E. Direct expenditures for construction would be approximately \$77.4 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 208 jobs during construction and construction costs would be approximately \$125,068,000 over a period of 4-10 years. During operation of its various commercial uses, Alternative G 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
<p>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).</p>	BE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Tribe shall negotiate a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Sonoma County that provides annual payments of at least \$43,596 to mitigate for fiscal impacts to the County. 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 predominately 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 problems and pathological gambling disorders. 	LTS
<i>Operational</i>			
<p>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.</p>			

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
<p>B Similar to A.</p> <p>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.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
C Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
D Similar to A.	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Tribe shall negotiate a MOU with Sonoma County that provides annual payments of at least \$35,212 per year to mitigate for fiscal impacts to the County. (Also see A) 	LTS
<p>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)</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Tribe shall negotiate a MOU with Sonoma County that provides annual payments of at least \$33,535 per year to mitigate for fiscal impacts to the County. 	LTS
<p>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</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	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
focused more on Sonoma County than the City of Rohnert Park.		payments of at least \$181,724 per year to mitigate for fiscal impacts to the County. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	
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
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
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	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
(indirect/induced economic impacts). These induced/indirect economic impact would be similar to, but slightly less than those occurring under Alternative A.			
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 317 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 Alternative A. A beneficial indirect impact to the region would result.	BE	None recommended.	BE
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	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
<p>economic activity will result in a beneficial effect for the community.</p>			
<p><i>Fiscal Impacts on Local Jurisdictions</i></p>			
<p><i>City of Rohnert Park and Sonoma County</i></p>			
<p>A The cost to provide public safety services to the casino/hotel resort would be between \$265,000 and \$313,000. 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 implementation of Alternative A, resulting in a beneficial impact.</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Tribe shall negotiate a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Sonoma County that provides annual payments of at least \$43,596 to mitigate for fiscal impacts to the County. 	LTS
<p>Alternative A would generate a negative fiscal impact to the County (between approximately \$36,889 and \$43,596 per year) based on an expectation of increased County service costs coupled with a lesser anticipated increase in revenues.</p>			
<p>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.</p>			
<p>B Similar to A.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>C Similar to A.</p>	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
<p>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 \$35,212. Mitigation measures would ensure fiscal impacts to the County are less than significant.</p>	S	<p>The Tribe shall negotiate a MOU with Sonoma County that provides annual payments of at least \$35,212 per year to mitigate for fiscal impacts to the County.</p>	LTS
<p>E Fiscal impacts to the local jurisdictions would be similar, but reduced when compared to Alternative A.</p>	S	<p>The Tribe shall negotiate a MOU with Sonoma County that provides annual payments of at least \$33,535 per year to mitigate for fiscal impacts to the County.</p>	
<p>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.</p> <p>Unlike Alternatives A-E, the City of Rohnert Park MOU would not 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.</p>	S	<p>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 \$181,724 per year to mitigate for fiscal impacts to the County.</p>	LTS
<p>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.</p>	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
Social Effects			
<p>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. Which may result in a local increase in problem and pathological gambling, thus, contributions to treatment programs outlined in the MOU would ensure a less than significant impact to problem and pathological gambling. Mitigation measures have been included that would further reduce impacts to problem and pathological gambling.</p>	LTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Sonoma County that provides annual payments of at least \$630,662 to mitigate for fiscal impacts to the County. 	LTS
B Similar to A.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
C Similar to A.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
<p>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.</p>	LTS	<p>The Tribe shall negotiate a MOU with Sonoma County that provides annual payments of at least \$601,996 per year to mitigate for fiscal impacts to the County.</p>	LTS
<p>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</p>	LTS	<p>The Tribe shall negotiate a MOU with Sonoma County that provides annual payments of at least \$656,262 per year to mitigate for fiscal impacts to the County.</p>	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
<p>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 site could lead to an increased demand in calls for law enforcement service.</p> <p>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.</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 that provides annual payments of at least \$721,888 per year 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
<p>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.</p>	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
Environmental Justice			
<p>A No minority or low-income communities were identified in Section 3.7.4 in the vicinity of the Wilfred and Stony Point sites.</p>	NE	None recommended.	NE
<p>B Similar to A.</p>	NE	None recommended.	NE
<p>C Similar to A.</p>	NE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None recommended. 	NE
<p>D Similar to A.</p>	NE	None recommended.	NE
<p>E Similar to A</p>	NE	None recommended.	NE
<p>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.</p>	S	See Section 5.2.7 .	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
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
<i>Tribal Competition</i>			
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.			
4.8 RESOURCE USE PATTERNS			
<i>Transportation</i>			
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 .	S
C Impact to regional intersections and freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in Section 4.8.4 .	S	See Section 5.2.7 .	S
▪ 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 .	S
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
<i>Land Use</i>			
A Alternative A would be inconsistent with several local land use regulations. However, conflicts with surrounding land uses are not	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
expected.			
B Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
C Similar to A.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
D Land use effects would be similar to Alternative A, except at a somewhat reduced scale due to the reduced size of development for Alternative D.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
E Land use effects would be similar to Alternative A, except at a somewhat reduced scale due to the reduced size of development for Alternative E.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
F Similar to A.	LTS	Same as A.	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
Agriculture			
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. No development would occur on the southern Williamson Act parcels; therefore no impact would occur.	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 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	None recommended.	LTS
C Due to the relatively low quality and relatively small quantity of total land available for farming purposes, impacts to agriculture from the development of Alternative C are considered less than significant. No development would occur on the southern Williamson Act parcels, therefore no impact would occur.	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 significant under NEPA.\	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
G Land zoned for agricultural uses would not be lost and current land use would continue.	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
4.9 PUBLIC SERVICES			
<i>Water Supply</i>			
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	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
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 services would be less than significant.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
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
Wastewater			
A Average weekend demand for wastewater disposal would be approximately 354,000 gpd. <i>Off-Site Option</i> 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	LTS	If the Tribe disposes wastewater off-site, the Tribe would coordinate with the wastewater treatment plant operators and the City of Rohnert Park to pay appropriate connection fees and ongoing service charges. The Tribe would also pay the fair share cost of future expansion/improvements to increase	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
<p>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.</p>	LTS	wastewater capacity of the Laguna WWTP.	LTS
<p><i>On-Site Option</i> 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.</p>	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
<p>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</p>	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
<p>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 impact to public wastewater services is less than significant.</p>		None recommended.	LTS
<p>C Similar to Alternative B, except that the location of the sprayfields, and surface water discharge would be modified.</p>	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
<p>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.</p>	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
<p>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.</p>	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
<p>F Similar to A.</p> <p>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 Lakeville Site. The overall impact to public wastewater services is less than significant.</p>	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
<p>Solid Waste</p>			
<p>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.</p>	LTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	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
<p>B Construction of Alternative B would result in a temporary increase in waste generation.</p> <p>Solid waste generation from operational uses is estimated at 12.1 tons per year</p>	LTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Tribe shall install a trash compactor for cardboard and 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. <p>Construction waste will be recycled to the fullest extent practicable by diverting green waste and recyclable building materials from the solid waste stream.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmentally preferable materials shall be used to the extent practical for construction of facilities. • The Tribe shall, to the extent determined by the Tribe to be feasible and commercially reasonable, implement single stream recycling and green waste diversion. The Tribe shall either retain the services of the City's solid waste disposal franchiser or select the contractor 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
<p>C Construction of Alternative C would result in temporary increase of solid waste generation.</p> <p>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 generated by Alternative A.</p>	LTS	<p>dispose of solid waste generated at the casino.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Tribe shall install a trash compactor for cardboard and 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 project to encourage people not to litter at the Stony Point site. <p>Security guards shall be trained to discourage littering on-site. If the Tribe disposes wastewater off-site, the Tribe would coordinate with the wastewater treatment plant operators and the City of Rohnert Park to pay appropriate connection fees and ongoing service charges. The Tribe would also pay the fair share cost of future expansion/improvements to increase wastewater capacity of the Laguna WWTP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as A. 	LTS
<p>D Construction of Alternative D would result in temporary increase of solid waste generation.</p>	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
<p>Solid waste generation from operational uses is estimated at 10.6 tons per day.</p> <p>E Construction of Alternative E would result in temporary increase of solid waste generation.</p>	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
<p>Solid waste generation from operational uses is estimated at 10.4 tons per day.</p> <p>F Construction of Alternative F would result in temporary increase of solid waste generation.</p>	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
<p>Solid waste generation from operational uses is estimated at 12.1 tons per year.</p> <p>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.</p>	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
<p>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 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.</p> <p>The expected waste generation impact from the Wilfred Site under this alternative would be less than significant.</p>			

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
<p><i>Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications</i></p> <p>A Operation of Alternative A would not result in a significant demand on electricity, natural gas or telecommunications.</p>	LTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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 necessary. 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 paper products. Environmentally preferable materials shall be used to the extent practical for construction of 	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 Operation of Alternative B would not result in a significant demand	LTS	<p>facilities.</p> <p>The Tribe shall, to the extent determined by the Tribe to be feasible and commercially reasonable, implement single stream recycling and green waste diversion. The Tribe shall either retain the services of the City's solid waste disposal franchiser or select the contractor to dispose of solid waste generated at the casino.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Tribe shall install a trash compactor for cardboard and 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. Decorative trash and recycling receptacles will be placed strategically throughout the project to encourage people not to litter at the Wilfred site. • Security guards shall be trained to discourage littering on-site. <p>The Tribe shall pay all standard fees for trash collection and disposal.</p> <p>Same as A.</p>	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
on electricity, natural gas or telecommunications.			
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.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
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 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.			
Public Health and Safety			

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
<p>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.</p>	S	<p>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.</p>	LTS
<p>B Same as A. Alternative B includes additional public health and safety commitment in the City MOU.</p>	S	<p>Same as A.</p>	LTS
<p>C Same as A. Alternative C includes additional public health and safety commitment in the City MOU.</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as A. 	LTS
<p>D Same as A.</p>	S	<p>Same as A.</p>	LTS
<p>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.</p>	S	<p>Public Health and Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	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 Same as A.	LTS	inspecting facilities. Also see mitigation measures under Land Resources for Seismicity.	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
<i>Law Enforcement</i>			
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. The cost to serve the hotel/casino resort for all public safety services (including law enforcement and fire protection) would be approximately \$313,000 per year (Appendix N). Without an agreement for primary law enforcement services there would either be significant impacts to County resources to provide primary services to the hotel/casino resort without degrading existing services or there would be a significant degradation of services throughout the County caused by allocating some existing resources to the Wilfred site.	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 to identify the signs of intoxication and to cease 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 	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
		<p>of auto theft and other related criminal activity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Tribe shall provide traffic control with appropriate signage and the presence of peak-hour traffic control staff. 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 Responsible Beverage Service Training (RBST), also known as “server training.” RBST educates managers, 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 server training must at a minimum include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 identify intoxicated customers. How to refuse service to underage youth and intoxicated 	

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
		<p>customers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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, 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 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 	

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
<p>B Although specific effects to crime rates are uncertain (see Section 4.7 and Appendix N), an attraction of the size proposed for Alternative B would result in increased law enforcement activity on the Wilfred Site due to increased visitors to the site. The cost to serve the hotel/casino resort for all public safety services (including law enforcement and fire protection) would be approximately \$313,000 per year (Appendix N). The MOU with the City of Rohnert Park states that the Tribe and the City agree that the compensation specified in the MOU is sufficient to offset the cost of equipment, other capital improvements, and other expenditures which the City deems necessary or appropriate to mitigate impacts of a gaming facility on the City's law enforcement services.</p>	S	<p>loitering and loitering behavior that could potentially lead to other criminal acts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to operation, the Tribe shall negotiate a Memorandum of Understanding to provide the City of Rohnert Park at least \$313,000 annually for public safety services or the Tribe shall compensate Sonoma County for additional public safety service demands caused by the operation of the development where deemed necessary by the parties. <p>Same as A.</p>	LTS
<p>C Similar to A.</p>	S	<p>Same as A.</p>	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
<p>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. As there is currently no signed agreement for providing law enforcement services, the impact is considered significant.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>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. The cost to serve the hotel/casino resort for all public safety services (\$241,000 per year) is considered a significant impact.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>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 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. As there is currently no signed agreement for providing law enforcement services, the impact is considered significant.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>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</p>	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
<p>significant.</p> <p>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.</p>			
<p><i>Fire Protection</i></p>			
<p>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. The cost to serve the hotel/casino resort for all public safety services (including law enforcement and fire protection) would be approximately \$313,000 per year (Appendix N). Without an agreement for primary fire protection services there could be significant impacts to County resources, including the Rincon Valley Fire District, which currently provides fire protection services to a majority of the Wilfred Site.</p>	<p>S</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>LTS</p>

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
		<p>governing the different occupancies associated with the project structures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Tribe shall employ the most modern construction and 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 negotiate a formal agreement with a fire service provider to provide primary fire protection services. • In addition, see mitigation for public safety contributions under Law Enforcement. 	

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
<p>B Construction of Alternative B would introduce potential sources of fire to the Wilfred site similar to Alternative A. This risk, which is similar to those that are found at other construction sites, would be considered potentially significant. Operation of Alternative B would result in increased calls for service and a potential increase in response time of the City's fire services. The cost to serve the hotel/casino resort for all public safety services (including law enforcement and fire protection) would be approximately \$313,000 per year (Appendix N). The City of Rohnert Park and the Tribe state in the MOU that the compensation detailed within the MOU is sufficient to cover the cost to the City of constructing and equipping a new public safety building which is of sufficient size and quality to mitigate potential impacts of a gaming facility on fire protection and first responder services. As there is currently no signed agreement for providing fire protection services, the impact is considered significant.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>C Similar to A.</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as A. 	LTS
<p>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.</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as A. 	LTS
<p>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.</p>	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
<p>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.</p>	S	<p>Same as A, as well as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
<p>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 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.</p>	LTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None recommended. 	LTS
Schools			
<p>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</p>	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
residents. Thus impacts to public school services would be less than significant.			
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 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
4.10 OTHER VALUES			
Noise			

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
<p>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 traffic, parking lot activity, loading dock activities, wastewater treatment plant operation, and tour bus idling.</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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. 	LTS
<p>B Similar to A.</p>	S	<p>Same as A.</p>	LTS
<p>C Similar to A.</p>	S	<p>Same as A.</p>	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 including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Alternative G would result in no change in the existing noise environment therefore no impacts would occur in development planned by the Northwest Specific Plan and would result in construction and operation noise on 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

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
<p><i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i></p> <p>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.</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) for filling and servicing construction equipment and vehicles. The SOPs, which are designed to reduce the potential for incidents involving the hazardous materials, shall include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Refueling shall be conducted only with approved pumps, hoses, and nozzles. b. Catch-pans shall be placed under equipment to catch 	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
		<p>potential spills during servicing.</p> <p>c. All disconnected hoses shall be placed in containers to collect residual fuel from the hose.</p> <p>d. Vehicle engines shall be shut down during refueling.</p> <p>e. No smoking, open flames, or welding shall be allowed in refueling or service areas.</p> <p>f. Refueling shall be performed away from bodies of water to prevent contamination of water in the event of a leak or spill.</p> <p>g. Service trucks shall be provided with fire extinguishers and spill containment equipment, such as absorbents.</p> <p>h. Should a spill contaminate soil, the soil shall be put into containers and disposed of in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	

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
		<p>feasible, the contractor will keep these areas clear of combustible materials in order to maintain a firebreak.</p> <p>k. Any construction equipment that normally includes a spark arrester shall be equipped with an arrester in good working order.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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 	

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
		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	
B Similar to A..	S	Same as A.	LTS
C Potentially significant effects are the same as those described under Alternative A.	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
Visual 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
<p>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.</p>	LTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Tribe will incorporate design elements into the project to minimize the impact of buildings and parking lots on the viewshed. These elements include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
<p>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.</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To minimize the impacts of light and glare: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 downcast. d. Timers should be utilized so as to minimize lighting after a certain hour. 	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
<p>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.</p>	S	Same as A.	S
<p>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.</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as A. 	S
<p>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.</p>	S	Same as A.	S
<p>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.</p>	S	Same as A.	S
<p>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.</p>	S	Same as A.	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
<p>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.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>4.11 INDIRECT AND GROWTH INDUCING EFFECTS</p>			
<p>4.11.3 Indirect Effects From Off-Site Traffic Mitigation</p>			
<p><u>Land Resources</u></p>			
<p>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 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</p>	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
<p>effects to land resources. The roadway improvements would not significantly affect the ability to extract minerals.</p>	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
<p>Water Resources</p>			
<p>The development of roadway improvements at the locations identified could affect water resources due to grading and construction activities and an increase in impervious surfaces. Potential effects include an increase of surface runoff and increased erosion that could adversely affect surface water quality due to increases in sediment and roadway pollutants such as grease and oil.</p>			
<p>As discussed above, a SWPPP would be developed to comply with the NPDES General Construction Permit Program, which includes soil erosion and sediment control practices. The effects to runoff volumes resulting from the increase in impervious roadways 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 water resources would be less than significant.</p>			
<p><u>Air Quality</u></p>			

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
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Biological Resources</p> <p>Construction of the roadway improvements would result in the loss of some existing vegetation and modification of drainage channels. Removal of sensitive native vegetation and vegetation that</p>	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
<p>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</p>	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
<p>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.</p> <p>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. To address effects to sensitive habitat and species, biological surveys would 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. Due to the limited nature of the improvements along existing roadways, the degraded condition of existing habitat, and the requirements of CEQA 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 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.</p> <p>Cultural Resources</p>			

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
<p>The construction of the roadway improvements has the potential to disturb or destroy historical features and archaeological resources. Grading roadsides to add traffic lanes 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.</p> <p>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.</p>	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
<p>Socioeconomic Conditions</p>			
<p>Construction of roadway improvements would result in short-term inconveniences and minor delays due to constricted traffic movements and possible temporary detouring of traffic. The intersection improvements are not expected to result in long-term disruption of access to surrounding land uses or to minority or low-income populations.</p>	S	The Tribe would pay the fair-share cost of traffic mitigation, including the cost of any required land acquisition.	LTS
<p>The realignment and expansion of roadways would result in</p>			

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
<p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Public Services</p>			
<p><i>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 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.</i></p>	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
<p>Other Values</p>			

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
<p>Construction of the proposed improvements could potentially result in noise, hazardous materials, and visual effects. Construction activities would result in short-term increases in the local ambient noise environments. However, because construction activities would be temporary in nature and are expected to occur during normal daytime hours, a less than significant effect is expected.</p> <p>The accidental release of hazardous materials used during grading and construction activities could pose a hazard to construction employees and the environment. Additionally, equipment used during grading and construction activities could ignite dry grasses and weeds in construction areas. However, these hazards, which are common to construction activities, would be minimized with adherence to 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.</p> <p><i>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.</i></p>	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
<p>4.11.3 Indirect Effects From Off-Site Pipeline Construction</p>			
<p>Land Resources</p>			
<p>The construction of off-site pipelines would occur primarily along existing roadways and would require trenching and backfilling/re-</p>	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
<p>paving in order to install the pipelines within the roadway. Therefore, 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.</p>	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
<p>Water Resources</p>			
<p>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.</p>	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
<p>Air Quality</p>			
<p>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</p>	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
<p>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.</p>			
<p>Biological Resources</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>None recommended.</p>	<p>LTS</p>
<p>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 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.</p> <p>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</p>			

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
extending existing pipelines would be less than significant.			
Cultural Resources			
<p>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 resources.</p> <p>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.</p>	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
Socioeconomic Conditions			
<p>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</p>	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
<p>in a significant indirect effect to socioeconomic conditions.</p>			
Land Use			
<p>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 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.</p>	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
Agriculture			
<p>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</p>	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
significant indirect impact to agriculture would occur.			
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 would be maintained during the construction period.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS/LTS
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.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
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			

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
<p>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.</p> <p>Because the proposed water and wastewater lines would be constructed below ground, visual indirect effects would be less than significant..</p> <p>4.12 CUMULATIVE</p> <p>Land Resources</p> <p>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.</p>	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 Alternative A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
C. 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
D Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
E Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
F The geographic area for the analysis of cumulative impacts to land resources is southern Sonoma County. Cumulative impacts are similar to Alternative A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS/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	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
<p>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.</p>			
<p>Water Resources</p>			
<p>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-basin are considered.</p>	LTS	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.3 , Water Resources.	LTS
<p>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.</p>			
<p>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</p>			

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
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 groundwater.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
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	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
<p>Alternative F in Section 4.3. When mitigation is fully implemented, impacts would be rendered less than significant.</p>	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
<p><i>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.</i></p> <p>Air Quality</p> <p><i>Ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} Emissions</i></p> <p>A Alternative A would generate 1.94% 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 0.624% in the near term and 0.389% in 2020. The PM₁₀ contribution for Alternative A is a little more with 3.26% in the near term and 2.43% in 2020. The PM_{2.5} contribution to southern Sonoma County is similar to PM₁₀ with 3.16% 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 PM₁₀ emissions, where percentages are almost 4%. Alternative A would exacerbate the regional trend towards higher PM₁₀ emissions.</p> <p>In 2020, ROG emissions generated by casino traffic would exceed the 80 pounds per day (ppd) and 15 tons per year (tpy) significance</p>	S	<p>Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.4, Air Quality. Mitigation could potentially reduce the cumulative effects of Alternative A to a less than significant level, but without empirical data to generate a repeatable reduction rate, it is conservatively assumed that substantial reductions would not occur and that a significant cumulative effect on air quality remains after mitigation.</p>	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
<p>thresholds, NO_x emissions would exceed the 80 ppd and 15 tpy significance thresholds, and PM₁₀ emissions would exceed the 80 ppd and 15 tpy significance thresholds; significant effects would result. ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ emissions associated with operation of Alternative A could be reduced, but not to a less-than-significant level, by requiring the mitigation measures contained in Section 4.4 above.</p>	S	Same as A.	S
<p>B Operation of Alternative B is estimated to result in the same emissions as Alternative A. Thus, a significant cumulative effect would result for ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ emissions. ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ emissions associated with the operation of Alternative B could be reduced, but not to a less than significant level by requiring the mitigation measures contained in Section 4.4 above.</p>	S	Same as A.	S
<p>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 PM₁₀ emissions. ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ emissions associated with the operation of Alternative C could be reduced, but not to a less than significant level by requiring the mitigation measures contained in Section 5.2.3.</p>	S	Same as A.	S
<p>D Alternative D generated 1.6% of the southern portion of Sonoma County total NO_x in near term and only 1.0% 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.</p>	S	Same as A.	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
<p>E In 2020, ROG emissions generated by Alternative E traffic would be less than the 80 ppb and 15 tpy significance thresholds, NO_x emissions would be less than the 80 ppb and 15 tpy significance thresholds, and PM₁₀ emissions would be less than the 80 ppb and 15 tpy significance threshold. Alternative E would result in a less than significant cumulative effect to ozone precursor and PM₁₀ 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.</p>	S	Same as A.	S
<p>F In 2020, ROG emissions generated by casino traffic would exceed the 80 ppb and 15 tpy significance thresholds, NO_x emissions would exceed the 80 ppb and 15 tpy significance thresholds, and PM₁₀ emissions would exceed the 80 ppb and 15 tpy significance thresholds; significant effects would result. ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ emissions associated with operation of Alternative F could be reduced, but not to a less than significant level by requiring the mitigation measures contained in Section 4.4 above.</p>	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
<p>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 PM₁₀ 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 PM₁₀ 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 PM₁₀.</p>			
<i>Carbon Monoxide Concentrations</i>			
<p>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.</p>	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

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 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 <i>Transportation Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol</i> (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.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
<i>Odor Effects</i>			
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	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
from odors.			
B Cumulative impacts from odors and toxic air contaminants are similar to Alternative A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
C Similar to A.	S	None recommended.	LTS
D Similar to A.	S	None recommended.	LTS
E Similar to A.	S	None recommended.	LTS
F Similar to A.	S	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.	S	None recommended.	LTS
<i>Toxic Air Contaminants</i>			

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. 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 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.	S	None recommended.	LTS
B Similar to A.	S	None recommended.	LTS
C Similar to A.	S	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

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 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 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.	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
Biological Resources			
<p>A <i>Wildlife and Habitats</i></p> <p>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 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 wildlife and habitats.</p>	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.5 , Biological Resources.	LTS
<i>Federally Listed Species</i>			
<p>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.</p>	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.5 , Biological Resources.	LTS
<i>Migratory Birds</i>			
<p>Alternative A is not anticipated to result in significant direct or</p>		Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.5 , Biological	

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
<p>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. 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.</p>	S	Resources.	LTS
<p><i>Waters of the U.S.</i></p> <p>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 loss of on-site waters of the U.S. or wetlands. Thus, significant cumulative effects to “waters of the U.S.” would not occur.</p>	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.5 , Biological Resources.	LTS
<p>B <i>Wildlife and Habitats</i></p> <p>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 Rohnert Park area such as the Santa Rosa Sub-regional IRWP,</p>	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
<p>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.</p>			
<i>Federally Listed Species</i>			
Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
<i>Migratory Birds</i>			
Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
<i>Waters of the U.S.</i>			
<p>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</p>	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
sedimentation and increase flood storage on the site. After 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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>significant cumulative impact.</p> <p>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.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p><i>G Wildlife and Habitats</i></p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>Federally Listed Species</i></p> <p>Disturbance to seasonal wetlands, California tiger salamander habitat, and increases in human activity resulting from Alternative G and other proposed projects in the Rohnert Park area could</p>			

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
<p>cumulatively and adversely effect federally listed species. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact to Threatened and/or Endangered Species.</p>			
<p><i>Migratory Birds</i></p>			
<p>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.</p>			
<p><i>Waters of the U.S.</i></p>			
<p>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.</p>			
<p>Cultural Resources</p>			
<p>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</p>	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.6 , Cultural Resources.	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
<p>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.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>B 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 two historic archaeological sites (RPC-1 and -5) that are potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>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.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>D Cumulative effects to cultural resources would be similar to those of Alternative B, given that the development footprint would be similar.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>E Cumulative effects to cultural resources would be similar to those of Alternative B, given that the development would affect the same</p>	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
<p>potentially eligible cultural resources as Alternative B.</p> <p>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.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>G <i>The Rohnert Park General Plan EIR identified potentially 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.</i></p>	S	Same as mitigation measures in the Rohnert Park General Plan EIR.	LTS
Socioeconomic Conditions			
<p>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,</p>	LTS	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.7 , Socioeconomic Conditions.	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
<p>increased or decreased healthcare for residents.</p> <p>Alternative A would introduce a substantial new source of economic activity to Sonoma County. Once operational, Alternative A's casino/hotel resort would become Sonoma County's largest employer (assumes 2,400 jobs created).</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>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,</i></p>			

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
<p><i>several other casinos and card rooms exist in the region, and internet gambling is prevalent, the introduction of an additional 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.</i></p>			
<p>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. Potential negative incremental social and fiscal effects will be offset from the Tribe's contribution to problem gambling programs.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>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. Potential negative incremental social and fiscal effects will be offset from the Tribe's contribution to problem gambling programs.</p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>D Cumulative socioeconomic effects of Alternative D would be similar, but reduced in intensity, to those of Alternative A. The Rohnert Park MOU would not apply to Alternative D, resulting in additional negative cumulative fiscal effects on the City of Rohnert Park.</p>	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
<p><i>E Cumulative socioeconomic effects of Alternative E would be similar, but reduced in intensity, to those of Alternative A. The Rohnert Park MOU would not apply to Alternative E, resulting in additional negative cumulative fiscal effects on the City of Rohnert Park. Also, gaming related impacts would not occur.</i></p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p><i>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.</i></p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p><i>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.</i></p>	LTS	None recommended	LTS
<u>Resource Use Patterns</u>			
A Transportation/Circulation			

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
<p>Incremental cumulative impacts to regional intersections and freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in Section 4.12.3, Alternative A.</p>	S	See Section 5.2.7 .	LTS
<p><i>Agriculture</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>B Transportation/Circulation</p>			
<p>Incremental cumulative impacts to regional intersections and freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in Section</p>	S	See Section 5.2.7 .	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
<p>4.12.3, Alternative B.</p> <p><i>Agriculture</i></p> <p>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, 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.</p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>C Transportation/Circulation</p> <p>Incremental cumulative impacts to regional intersections and</p>			

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
<p>freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in Section 4.12.3, Alternative C.</p>	S	See Section 5.2.7 .	S
<p><i>Agriculture</i></p> <p><i>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 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.</i></p>			
<p>D <i>Transportation/Circulation</i></p> <p>Incremental cumulative impacts to regional intersections and freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in Section 4.12.3, Alternative D.</p>	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
<p><i>Agriculture</i></p> <p>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 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.</p>	S	See Section 5.2.7.	LTS
<p>E <i>Transportation/Circulation</i></p> <p>Incremental cumulative impacts to regional intersections and freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in Section 4.12.3, Alternative E.</p> <p><i>Agriculture</i></p> <p>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</p>			

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
<p>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 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.</p>	S	See Section 5.2.7.	S
<p>F <i>Transportation/Circulation</i></p>			
<p>Incremental cumulative impacts to regional intersections and freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in Section 4.12.3, Alternative F.</p>			
<p><i>Agriculture</i></p>			
<p>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</p>			

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
<p>Alternative F on agricultural resources are not considered to significantly contribute to past, present and future effects of other projects to agriculture within the project vicinity.</p>	LTS	See Section 5.2.7 for a listing of recommended traffic mitigation measures.	LTS
<p>G <i>Transportation/Circulation</i></p>			
<p>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.</p>			
<p>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.</p>			
<p>Public Services</p>			
<p>A <i>Water Supply</i></p>			
<p>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</p>	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
<p>from the same groundwater basin. The overall cumulative effect on the regional groundwater basin from the Tribe's production wells is less than significant.</p> <p>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.</p>	S	Same as mitigation listed in Section 4.9 , Public Services.	LTS
<p><i>Wastewater Service</i></p> <p>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</p>			

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
<p>when combined with foreseeable development projects through 2025.</p> <p>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).</p>			
<i>Solid Waste</i>	LTS	Same as mitigation listed in Section 4.9 , Public Services.	LTS
<p>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.</p>	LTS	Same as mitigation listed in Section 4.9 , Public Services.	LTS
<i>Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications</i>			
<p>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.</p>			

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
<p>Thus, the cumulative effects would be less than significant.</p> <p><i>Law Enforcement</i></p> <p>Cumulative effects related to law enforcement could occur in the region as the result of inadequate law enforcement resources and/or increased response times.</p> <p>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, and through the anticipated MOU with the City of Rohnert Park, the Tribe would provide funding for impacts to law enforcement services. This funding would be beneficial in providing additional officers for expected growth. There is currently no signed agreement with the City of Rohnert Park for law enforcement services this impact is considered significant. With mitigation measures listed in Section 5.2.8, this impact would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>	S	Same as mitigation listed in Section 4.9 , Public Services.	LTS
<p><i>Fire Protection/Emergency Medical</i></p> <p>Cumulative effects related to fire protection and emergency</p>			

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
<p>medical services could occur in the region as a result of inadequate resources and/or increased response times to existing and planned development.</p> <p>The incorporated areas of Sonoma County address increased 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. There is currently no signed agreement with the City of Rohnert Park for fire protection or emergency medical services, this impact is considered significant. With mitigation measures listed in Section 5, this impact would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>	S	Same as mitigation listed in Section 4.9 , Public Services.	LTS
<i>Schools</i>			
<p>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</p>	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
<p>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.</p>	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
<p>B The cumulative impact of Alternative B on public services is substantially similar to Alternative A, given the identical facilities and proximity in location. However, for Alternative B there is currently a signed MOU with the City of Rohnert Park. For water supply, solid waste, electricity, natural gas, telecommunications, and schools the cumulative impact is the same as Alternative A and less than significant. The impact to solid waste facilities is similar to that described under Alternative A</p>	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
<p><i>Wastewater supply</i></p>	LTS	None recommended	LTS
<p>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.</p>	LTS	None recommended	LTS
<p><i>Law Enforcement/ Fire Protection/Emergency Medical Services</i></p>	S	Same as mitigation listed in Section 4.9 , Public Services.	LTS
<p>Cumulative impacts would be similar to Alternative A. Given that there is currently no signed agreement for fire protection services,</p>	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
a potentially significant impact would result.			
C Effects to public services would not differ from Alternative B. There is currently no signed for law enforcement or fire protection services, thus this impact is considered 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 for law enforcement or fire protection services, thus this impact is considered significant, and the Rohnert Park MOU would not apply. For water supply, wastewater service, solid waste, electricity, natural gas, telecommunications, and schools the impact would be less than significant.	S	Same as mitigation listed in Section 4.9 , Public Services.	LTS
E <i>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 for law enforcement or fire protection services, thus this impact is considered significant. For water supply, wastewater service, solid waste, electricity, natural gas, telecommunications, and schools the impact would be less than significant.</i>	LTS	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
<p>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 for law enforcement or fire protection services, thus this impact is considered significant. For water supply, wastewater service, solid waste, electricity, natural gas, telecommunications, and schools the impact would be less than significant.</p>	S	Same as mitigation listed in Section 4.9 , Public Services.	LTS
<p>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.</p> <p>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 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.</p>	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
Other Values		Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.10 , Other	

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
<p>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.</p>			

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
<p>B <i>Noise</i></p> <p>Similar to Alternative A.</p> <p><i>Hazardous Materials</i></p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>Visual Resources</i></p> <p>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 environment.</p>	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
<p>C <i>Noise</i></p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>Hazardous Materials</i></p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>Visual Resources</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>D <i>Noise</i></p> <p>Noise effects would be similar to Alternative B, however reduced in intensity, given that Alternative D is reduced in size and scope to</p>	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
<p>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.</p>			
<p><i>Hazardous Materials</i></p>			
<p>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.</p>			
<p><i>Visual Resources</i></p>			
<p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>E <i>Noise</i></p>	S	Same as A.	LTS
<p>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</p>			

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
any sensitive receptors within the mobile home park.			
<i>Hazardous Materials</i>			
<p>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.</p>			
<i>Visual Resources</i>			
<p>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.</p>			

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
<p>F <i>Noise</i></p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>Visual Resources</i></p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>Hazardous Materials</i></p> <p>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.</p>	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
<p>G <i>Noise</i></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>Visual Resources</i></p> <p>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 G would be</p>	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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>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.</p>			
<p><i>Hazardous Materials</i></p>			
<p><i>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.</i></p>			

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE