

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

***COWLITZ INDIAN TRIBE
TRUST ACQUISITION AND CASINO PROJECT
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT***

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

COWLITZ INDIAN TRIBE TRUST ACQUISITION AND CASINO PROJECT FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

ES.1 INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has been prepared to assess the environmental consequences of the following proposed Federal actions in response to the Cowlitz Indian Tribe's (hereinafter "Tribe") requests.

- (1) The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) acquisition in trust of eight parcels totaling approximately 151.87 acres;
- (2) The Secretary of the Interior's issuance of a reservation proclamation; and
- (3) The National Indian Gaming Commission's (NIGC) approval of a gaming development and management contract.

The foreseeable consequence of the Proposed Action will be the development of a casino-resort complex and Tribal Government facilities. The effects of development alternatives, as well as the No Action alternative, are analyzed within this EIS. The Proposed Project site is located in unincorporated Clark County, Washington, approximately 2 miles west of the City of La Center, 3 miles northeast of the City of Ridgefield, and 4 miles south of the City of Woodland. The Proposed Project site is bisected by NW 319th Street, which runs east-west through the property.

ES.2 PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose and need for taking the property into Federal trust, issuing of a reservation proclamation, and approving the gaming development and management contract is to advance the BIA's "Self Determination" policy of promoting the Tribe's self-governance capacity. The Proposed Action will facilitate the establishment of a land base for the Tribe that will be developed to improve the long-term economic vitality and self-governance of the Tribe and its members through the creation of a stable, sustainable source of employment and revenue. Revenues generated from the proposed economic development will be used to support a variety of fundamental Tribal governmental, administrative, operational, social, and educational programs to benefit Tribal members, including the building of governmental offices, a cultural center and Tribal elder housing.

ES.3 ALTERNATIVES

This document describes and analyzes five development alternatives and the No Action alternative. The alternatives vary in the degree to which they meet the purpose and need of the Tribe and the BIA. Alternative A is considered to most suitably meet all of the purposes and needs of the Tribe and, therefore, is the Preferred Alternative.

Four of the development alternatives (A, B, C, and D) include placing approximately 151.87 acres into Federal trust status. The off-site alternative (Alternative E – Ridgefield Interchange Site) includes placing approximately 163.02 acres into Federal trust status. The alternatives are described in detail in **Section 2.0** and are summarized below.

ES.3.1 ALTERNATIVE A – PREFERRED CASINO-RESORT PROJECT

Alternative A, the Preferred Alternative, includes approval of the Tribe’s application for the fee-to-trust acquisition, issuance of a reservation proclamation by the Department of the Interior, and approval of a gaming development and management contract by the NIGC. The foreseeable consequence of these actions will be the development of a casino-resort complex on approximately 151.87 acres of land within unincorporated Clark County, Washington.

This alternative consists of construction of a 1,183,635-square-foot gaming, entertainment, and hotel complex with video lottery terminals (VLTs) and Class III (Nevada style) gaming and activities. Additional components include the development of parking facilities, a recreational vehicle (RV) Park, wastewater treatment plant, and Tribal facilities (Tribal government offices, a cultural center, and elder housing). The casino-resort complex and Tribal facilities would occupy the entire project site. Under this alternative, NW 319th Street would be rerouted through the southern half of the property. This requires the vacation of the existing NW 319th Street and acceptance of the new right-of-way location by Clark County.

ES.3.2 ALTERNATIVE B – PREFERRED CASINO-RESORT PROJECT WITHOUT REROUTING NW 319TH STREET

Alternative B is similar to Alternative A in most aspects, entailing the placement of the property into trust, issuance of a reservation proclamation, and approval of a gaming development and management contract. Under this alternative, however, NW 319th Street would not be rerouted. The right-of-way for NW 319th Street would remain in its current location and would continue to provide access to local housing, as well as the proposed casino-resort complex. Tribal government offices, a cultural center, and elder housing would continue to be project elements.

ES.3.3 ALTERNATIVE C – REDUCED INTENSITY

Alternative C consists of approval of the Tribe’s application for the fee-to-trust acquisition, issuance of a reservation proclamation by the Department of the Interior, and approval of a gaming development and management contract by the NIGC. Alternative C includes the development of a reduced size casino-resort complex on the same project site identified in Alternative A.

This alternative consists of construction of an 809,728-square-foot gaming, entertainment, and hotel complex with VLTs and Class III gaming and activities. As with Alternative A, additional components include parking facilities, an RV park, a wastewater treatment plant, and Tribal facilities. The casino-resort complex and Tribal facilities would occupy the entire project site. Under this alternative, the right-of-way for NW 319th Street would remain in its current location.

ES.3.4 ALTERNATIVE D – BUSINESS PARK

Alternative D is a non-gaming alternative that consists of the construction of a business park with proposed uses such as office, industrial flex-space and accessory commercial uses on the same project site identified in Alternative A. Approximately 1,590,800 square feet of space would be constructed with parking for approximately 3,700 vehicles. No on-site wastewater treatment plant is proposed for this Alternative.

ES.3.5 ALTERNATIVE E – RIDGEFIELD INTERCHANGE SITE

Alternative E consists of placing the casino-resort complex and associated facilities on approximately 163.02 acres located approximately 2 miles south of the Alternative A site, adjacent to the Ridgefield Interchange on Interstate 5 (I-5). This alternative would require that the property be brought into trust by the BIA through the CFR 25 Part 151 (Fee-to-Trust) process and that it be the subject of a request for a reservation proclamation. Additionally, Alternative E includes the approval of a gaming development and management contract by the NIGC.

This alternative consists of construction of a 1,162,745 square foot gaming, entertainment, and hotel complex with VLTs and Class III gaming and activities. Additional components include parking facilities, an RV park and Tribal facilities similar to those described in Alternative A. The casino-resort complex and Tribal facilities would occupy the entire project site. No on-site wastewater treatment plant is proposed for this Alternative.

ES.3.6 ALTERNATIVE F – NO ACTION

Under the No Action alternative, neither the 151.87-acre La Center Interchange Site, nor the 163.02-acre Ridgefield Interchange Site would be placed into Federal trust for the benefit of the Tribal

Government, and the sites would not be developed as described under any of the alternatives identified. Land use jurisdiction of the properties would remain with the local jurisdiction. For the purposes of the environmental analysis under this alternative, it is assumed that the properties would continue to be utilized for rural residential and agricultural purposes. This alternative would not meet the objectives of the Tribe or the Federal government in promoting self-determination and economic self-sufficiency of the Tribe.

ES.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND CONCLUSIONS

ES.4.1 ALTERNATIVE A – PREFERRED CASINO-RESORT PROJECT

Significant numbers of local residents believe that the proposed facility location is inappropriate; either because of the belief that the property is not on lands ancestral to the Cowlitz Indian Tribe, that the proposed facility would have adverse environmental impacts, or that adverse economic (competitive) impacts would result from the proposed location. Public concerns over problem gambling issues and the effects on public services were also frequently voiced.

Analysis in this FEIS indicates that implementation of Alternative A would result in reduction of revenue for competing gaming facilities (the La Center card rooms and the Spirit Mountain Casino). These revenue reductions would affect the City of La Center, which derives a significant portion of its revenue from taxes and fees collected from the card rooms. Additionally, revenue reductions would affect the government of the Grand Ronde Tribe, which derives its revenue from the Spirit Mountain Casino. Implementation of Alternative A would also result in increases in local traffic including minor effects on the I-5 Bridge and the Interstate 205 (I-205) Glen Jackson Bridge. Increased employment provided by Alternative A would result in a small amount of migration into the local area with minor effects on housing availability, local schools and other public services. Removal of the land from the civil jurisdiction of Clark County would replace Clark County's land use, zoning, and planning priorities with those of the Cowlitz Indian Tribe. Construction of the project, combined with the potential expansion of the La Center Urban Growth Area, would result in some induced growth in a small section of the I-5 corridor.

Whether the land in question is eligible for gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA) is a legal rather than environmental issue and accordingly, is not addressed in this EIS. While competitive effects are acknowledged, they are not expected to result in the inability of affected governments to provide basic services. To ensure impacts are less than significant, mitigation measures have been recommended that would result in the replacement of lost revenue for at least 10 years. It is assumed that during the 10-year period of payments, the City could arrange for alternative funding mechanisms similar to surrounding jurisdictions. Impacts to agencies providing services to problem gamblers would be avoided through Tribal contributions to problem gambling programs.

Implementation of traffic-related mitigation will ensure that effects to levels of service at local intersections are minor, and the project's contribution to effects on the Columbia River bridges is minor. As the amount of potential migration to the area produced by new employment opportunities is small, effects on local housing, schools and other public services would be small. As the Cowlitz Indian Tribe has agreed that it shares many of the goals and planning concerns of Clark County, and the total amount of land proposed for trust acquisition is small, land use conflicts with the County and the City of La Center are not considered significant. Similarly, growth induced by the Proposed Project is expected to be relatively insignificant. It is expected that all environmental impacts can be reasonably mitigated to less than significant levels, with the exception of impacts to air quality. Indirect air quality impacts, those induced by visitor traffic, consist of significant quantities of air pollutants. The generation of these pollutants is projected based on the trip generation model utilized in both the traffic and air studies, which incorporates an average trip length of 30 miles. Utilization of this trip generation model results in the conclusion that the pollutants will be dispersed over a large air basin. However, total pollutants will still exceed significance thresholds. Similarly, 6 p.m. to 7 p.m. peak hour trips generated on days with special events at the resort and casino have the potential to reduce levels of service on three north bound segments of I-5 and I-205. Physical mitigation is not proposed because of concerns over interference with proposed Columbia River Crossing improvements, although impacts may be lessened through establishment of shuttle bus service and park and ride sites.

ES.4.2 ALTERNATIVE B – PREFERRED CASINO-RESORT PROJECT WITHOUT REROUTING NW 319TH STREET

Implementation of Alternative B would result in the same controversies and environmental concerns as Alternative A.

ES.4.3 ALTERNATIVE C – REDUCED INTENSITY

Alternative C would cause similar impacts and controversies as Alternative A, although at a reduced scale. This alternative would not generate as much net revenue, and thus not meet the Purpose and Need of the Tribe to the same degree as Alternative A. Therefore, Alternative C is not the preferred alternative. Impacts from Alternative C would be slightly more intense than the No Action alternative, however all impacts could be reasonably mitigated to less than significant levels with the exception of impacts to air quality as stated in **Section ES. 4.1** above.

ES.4.4 ALTERNATIVE D – BUSINESS PARK

Like Alternatives A and B above, Alternative D poses a potential impact to the local and regional traffic infrastructure by creating greater system demand. In turn, Alternative D presents the potential for impacts to local and regional air quality resulting from the increased traffic. While Alternative D

avoids the controversy associated with competition to other regional gaming operations and the socioeconomic impacts related to gambling, it would not successfully address the objectives of the Tribe related to the generation of significant new revenues for the operation of Tribal governmental programs and the benefit of Tribal members. Therefore, Alternative D is not the preferred alternative. It is expected that all significant impacts can be reasonably mitigated to less than significant levels with the exception of impacts to air quality as stated in **Section ES. 4.1** above.

ES.4.5 ALTERNATIVE E –RIDGEFIELD INTERCHANGE SITE

The same controversies are present with Alternative E as with Alternatives A and B. Many commenters indicated that the Cowlitz Indian Tribe should not be allowed to game on the property under IGRA as, in their opinion, the lands are not ancestral to the Tribe. The environmental and socio-economic effects, including increased employment effects on housing, public service impacts such as impacts to schools and competitive effects on other gaming operations, are almost identical. As trip generation is similar, traffic impacts are similar. Indirect and growth inducing impacts are slightly different, as the Ridgefield area does not fall within the proposed expansion of the La Center Urban Growth Area. Notably, this location is not included in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Clark County, so while mitigation proposed is similar, different means of monitoring and enforcement will be required. It is expected that all significant impacts can be reasonably mitigated to less than significant with the exception of impacts to air quality as stated in **Section ES. 4.1** above.

ES.4.6 ALTERNATIVE F –NO ACTION

The No Action Alternative would not cause any significant environmental impacts, but would not meet the purposes and needs of the Tribe. Therefore, the No Action Alternative is not the preferred alternative.

ES.5 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND SUMMARY MATRIX

The environmental consequences of the alternatives analyzed within this EIS are summarized in **Table ES-1**. Mitigation measures have been identified where feasible to address specific effects regardless of whether they are considered “significant.” Mitigation measures identified in the design process have been incorporated into the project description (**Section 2.0**). Additional measures identified during the preparation of the EIS to mitigate specific effects are summarized in **Table ES-1** below. For a detailed discussion of environmental consequences, please see **Section 4.0** of this document.

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
Geology and Soils						
<i>Topography, Seismicity, and Mineral Resources</i>	<i>Substantial clearing and grading; preservation of major topographic features. –LS</i> <i>Project facilities would not be significantly affected by seismicity; the area where the property is located has low seismic risks, liquefaction and acceleration characteristics. –LS</i> <i>Grading and landform alteration would not adversely affect known or recorded mineral resources. No abandoned mines, shafts, or tailings are located within the project site. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Substantial clearing and grading; substantial modification of main topographic features. –S</i>	<i>Substantial clearing and grading; some modification of main topographic features. –S</i>	<i>NE</i>
<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>After Mitigation</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>Soils/Geology</i>	<i>Some soil erosion during construction, operation and maintenance activities including clearing, grading, trenching, and backfilling.</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Some soil erosion during construction, operation and maintenance activities including clearing, grading, trenching, and backfilling.</i>	<i>NE</i>

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<p><i>Implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Clark County and incorporation of the Erosion Control Plan would reduce effects to minimal. -LS</i></p>				<p><i>With incorporation of the Erosion Control Plan and Preliminary Grading Plan, effects to soils and geology would be minimal. -LS</i></p>	
Mitigation	<p><i>Permanent and temporary cut-and-fill slopes shall conform to an established standard.</i></p> <p><i>The Tribe shall obtain a General Construction National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in compliance with the provisions of the Federal Clean Water Act (CWA). The Tribe shall prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that shall address water quality impacts.</i></p> <p><i>Implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent erosion and minimize sediment transport.</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i></p>	N/A
After Mitigation	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	N/A

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
Water Resources						
<i>Flooding</i>	<i>The project site is located outside the 100- and 500-year floodplains. Flooding impacts are not expected. – NE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –NE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –NE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –NE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –NE</i>	<i>NE</i>
<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>After Mitigation</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>Construction Impacts</i>	<i>Potential discharge into surface waters of 1) sediment from erosion caused by construction-related ground disturbance; 2) construction-related materials such as concrete washings, oil, and grease; and 3) pollutants from the use of diesel-powered equipment and temporary storage of fuel and oil on site. –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	<i>NE</i>
<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>The Tribe shall prepare a SWPPP that shall address water quality impacts associated with construction of the project alternatives. Implementation of BMPs to prevent</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>N/A</i>

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	erosion and minimize sediment transport.					
	A sampling and monitoring program shall be implemented to assess the quality of surface water entering and leaving the project site.					
After Mitigation	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	N/A
Stormwater Runoff and Quality	Increase in stormwater runoff during rain events due to increased impervious surfaces on site. Potential for trash, debris, oil, sediments, grease, and fertilizer from stormwater runoff to impact water quality. Stormwater control facilities included in the project design would reduce peak stormwater flows and provide filtering of runoff to improve water quality. -LS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS	NE
Mitigation	The Tribe shall comply with all provisions of the CWA including the NPDES Program. The Tribe shall prepare a SWPPP that shall address water quality impacts associated with construction and	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	N/E

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	operation of the project alternatives.					
	Implementation of BMPs to prevent erosion and minimize sediment transport.					
After Mitigation	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	N/A
Wastewater	Wastewater would be treated at an on-site wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) and recycled for irrigation, toilet flushing, fire suppression, and use in the cooling system. Discharge of treated wastewater into the seasonal stream on site would improve water quality in the stream by reducing fecal coliform levels through dilution. However, WWTP may not currently be sized to meet denitrification requirements in accordance with WAC criteria for ammonia. Additionally, higher temperature treated wastewater could adversely impact receiving waters -PS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -PS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -PS	On-site disposal of wastewater is not proposed under this alternative. There would be no impacts to surface water from wastewater discharge. -NE	On-site disposal of wastewater is not proposed under this alternative. There would be no impacts to surface water from wastewater discharge. -NE	NE
Mitigation	The Tribe shall comply with all provisions of the CWA including the	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	N/A	N/A	N/A

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<p><i>NPDES Program.</i></p> <p><i>The Tribe shall prepare a SWPPP that shall address water quality impacts associated with construction and operation of the project alternatives.</i></p> <p><i>Implementation of BMPs to prevent erosion and minimize sediment transport.</i></p> <p><i>Construction of an underground pipe field to transfer heat from treated wastewater to the cooler soil, thereby reducing treated wastewater temperatures prior to discharge.</i></p> <p><i>The anoxic basin of the WWTP will be sized in accordance with the calculated ammonia criteria as determined through the NPDES permitting process when commenced.</i></p>					
<i>After Mitigation</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
<i>Groundwater Quality</i>	<p>Development would not require the use of on-site groundwater supplies. -NE</p> <p>Reclaimed water, treated and used on site would be comparable to or higher in quality than the existing groundwater quality. -LS</p> <p>Stormwater control facilities would provide filtering of runoff to improve water quality. The use of a natural detention pond would allow collected stormwater to percolate into the groundwater table. There would be no adverse impacts to groundwater resources from stormwater. -LS</p>	<p>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</p>	<p>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</p>	<p>Development would not require the use of on-site groundwater supplies. -NE</p> <p>No on-site wastewater treatment would occur. -NE</p>	<p>Impacts would be similar to Alternative D. -NE</p>	NE
<i>Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>After Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Air Quality						
CO, Stationary Sources, Construction, and Demolition Emissions	<p>Maximum carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations are below the 1-hour and 8-hour standards. -LS</p> <p>Stationary source</p>	<p>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</p>	<p>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</p>	<p>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</p>	<p>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</p>	NE

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<p><i>emissions from natural gas usage and diesel-powered emergency backup generators do not exceed the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) threshold for major sources. - LS</i></p> <p><i>Emissions from construction activities are expected to result in minimal effects on air quality. -LS</i></p> <p><i>Demolition activities would be subject to the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) regulations. Therefore, construction-related asbestos emissions are less than significant. -LS</i></p>					
Mitigation	<p><i>Control volatile organic compounds (VOCs), nitrogen oxide (NO_x), sulfur oxide gasses (SO_x), and CO whenever practicable.</i></p> <p><i>Control fugitive dust emissions during construction.</i></p> <p><i>The Tribe shall meet with the Southwest Clean Air Agency</i></p>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	N/A

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<i>(SWCAA) to address air quality complaints related to issues occurring on-reservation by citizens residing off-reservation.</i>					
<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	N/A
<i>Operational Emissions</i>	<i>Operation of this alternative would result in the generation of VOC, NO_x, and inhalable particulate matter (PM₁₀). This impact is considered significant. –S</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –S</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –S</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –S</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –S</i>	N/A
<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>The Tribe shall provide shuttles to population centers, transit stations, and multi-modal centers; use clean fuel vehicles in vehicle fleet where practicable; encourage the use of van- and car-pools; and provide adequate ingress and egress at facility entrances to minimize vehicle idling and traffic congestion.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>The Tribe shall encourage reduced setbacks for retail and employment land uses on streets with bus services consistent with zoning code requirements; provide adequate ingress and egress at facility entrances to minimize vehicle idling and traffic congestion; and encourage development that discourages auto-oriented uses in areas adjacent to bus stops and other transit facilities.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	N/A
<i>After Mitigation</i>	S	S	S	S	S	N/A
<i>Conformity Determination</i>	<i>The project area is either unclassifiable or in attainment for all</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as Alternative A.</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as Alternative A.</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as Alternative A.</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as Alternative A.</i>	NE

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<i>national standards and, therefore, would not be subject to a conformity determination. -NE</i>	-NE	-NE	-NE	-NE	
Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
After Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Biological Resources						
Wildlife and Habitats	<p>An increase in human activity on the project site would not significantly affect local populations of wildlife due to the presence of surrounding development and the reduced quality of existing habitat types on the site. -LS</p> <p>Ruderal/developed, pasture, and mixed woodland habitat types on the project site are subject to repeated human disturbances, thus decreasing the likelihood of supporting persistent wildlife populations -LS</p> <p>Jurisdictional roadside ditches and palustrine emergent wetlands impacted under this alternative provide</p>	<p>Impacts to local populations of wildlife; ruderal/developed, pasture, mixed woodland, and riparian habitat types; and jurisdictional roadside ditches would be the same as Alternative A. -LS</p> <p>8.41 acres of palustrine emergent wetlands and wetland buffer areas on the north side of NW 319th Street would be impacted by this alternative. - S</p>	<p>Impacts to local populations of wildlife; ruderal/developed, pasture, mixed woodland, and riparian habitat types; and jurisdictional roadside ditches and palustrine emergent wetlands would be the same as Alternative A. -LS</p>	<p>Impacts to local populations of wildlife. ruderal/developed, pasture, and mixed woodland habitats would be the same as Alternative A. -LS</p> <p>0.03 acres of palustrine emergent wetlands and 0.44 acres of jurisdictional roadside ditches would be impacted by this alternative. -S</p> <p>Riparian habitat would be impacted by increased stormwater discharge under this alternative. - S</p>	<p>Impacts to local populations of wildlife, ruderal/developed, and pasture habitat types would be the same as Alternative A. -LS</p> <p>1.65 acres of riparian habitat and 24.56 acres of potential wetland habitat would be impacted under this alternative. - S</p>	NE

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<p><i>limited resources for habitats due to their isolation and small size. -LS</i></p> <p><i>Discharge of treated stormwater and treated wastewater to the unnamed seasonal stream on site and removal of large grazing animals will improve the habitat quality of the stream. -LS</i></p>					
Mitigation	<p><i>Prior to construction, temporary fencing shall be installed around areas of wetland, intermittent drainage and riparian habitat in accordance with the Clark County Wetland Protection Ordinance. (CCWPO).</i></p> <p><i>A permit shall be obtained from the USACE prior to any discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S.</i></p> <p><i>The project shall incorporate BMPs for stormwater runoff, including sedimentation basins, vegetated swales, and runoff infiltration devices to ensure that the water quality of the on-site</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation relating to temporary fencing, obtaining a USACE permit prior to any discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S., incorporation of BMPs for stormwater runoff, and prevention of noxious weeds would be the same as Alternative A.</i></p> <p><i>Mitigation relating to obtaining a stormwater/wastewater discharge permit from the USACE and utilizing Wetland Cs as a detention basin would be the same as Alternative A.</i></p> <p><i>Palustrine wetlands on the northern boundary of the north parcel will</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation relating to temporary fencing, obtaining a USACE permit prior to any discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S., incorporation of BMPs for stormwater runoff, and prevention of noxious weeds would be the same as Alternative A.</i></p> <p><i>Mitigation relating to obtaining a stormwater/wastewater discharge permit from the USACE and utilizing Wetland Cs as a detention basin would be the same as Alternative A.</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation relating to temporary fencing, obtaining a USACE permit prior to any discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S., incorporation of BMPs for stormwater runoff, and prevention of noxious weeds would be the same as Alternative A.</i></p> <p><i>Mitigation relating to obtaining a stormwater discharge permit from the USACE and utilizing Wetland Cs as a detention basin would be the same as Alternative A.</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation relating to temporary fencing, obtaining a USACE permit prior to any discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S., incorporation of BMPs for stormwater runoff, and prevention of noxious weeds shall be the same as Alternative A.</i></p>	N/A

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<p><i>unnamed seasonal stream does not degrade. Stormwater runoff from the project site shall be monitored according to BMPs to assess the quality of water leaving the project site.</i></p> <p><i>Construction of stormwater and effluent discharging structures in the vicinity of the unnamed seasonal stream on site, and discharge to the stream, will require an NPDES permit and SWPPP monitoring.</i></p> <p><i>Development of Wetland Cs as a stormwater detention will be consistent with CCWPO standards. Runoff from paved surfaces will be treated prior to entering this stormwater detention basin.</i></p> <p><i>No plants or mulch containing seeds from plants designated as "noxious weeds" by the Washington State Noxious Weed Control Board shall be used for landscaping on the project site.</i></p>	<p><i>be replaced at a ratio determined by the CCWPO.</i></p>				

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	N/A
Federally Listed Plant Species	<i>The site and/or surrounding vicinity represent potential habitat for two Federally listed plant species: tall bugbane (Cimicifuga elata), and water howellia (Howellia aquatilis). -S</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -S</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -S</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -S</i>	<i>The site and/or surrounding vicinity represent potential habitat for one Federally listed plant species: tall bugbane. Biological surveys were conducted outside the blooming period for this species. Therefore, presence or absence could not be confirmed. -S</i>	NE
Mitigation	<i>Preconstruction bloom-period surveys shall be done for water howellia and tall bugbane. If the plants are present, the Tribe shall consult with the USFWS to determine appropriate mitigation measures.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>A preconstruction, bloom-period survey shall be conducted for tall bugbane. If the plant is present, the Tribe shall consult with the USFWS to determine appropriate mitigation measures.</i>	NA
<i>After Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	LS	N/A
Federally Listed Animal Species	<i>Three special status bat species have the potential to occur in the vicinity of the La Center Interchange Site. - S</i> <i>Six special status fish species may be affected by this alternative due to an increase in effluent discharge and stormwater runoff into the unnamed seasonal</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -S</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -S</i>	<i>Six special status fish species may be affected by this alternative due to an increase in stormwater runoff into the unnamed seasonal stream on site, a tributary to the East Fork Lewis River. -S</i> <i>Impacts to special status bat species and special status bird species would be the same as Alternative</i>	<i>Six special status fish species may be affected under this alternative due to an increase in stormwater runoff into the on-site stream, a tributary to the East Fork Lewis River. -S</i> <i>Impacts to special status bat species, and special status bird species would be the</i>	NE

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<p>stream on site, a tributary to the East Fork Lewis River. – S</p> <p>Two special status bird species, including olive-sided flycatchers, and slender-billed white-breasted nuthatches, have the potential to be adversely affected by this alternative due to potential vegetation removal during the nesting season. –S</p>			A. –S	same as Alternative A. – S	
Mitigation	<p>Preconstruction surveys shall be conducted prior to construction to determine if bat species are roosting on the project site. If bat species are not found roosting on the project site, then no further mitigation would be necessary. If bat species are found roosting on the project site, USFWS will be contacted to discuss potential mitigation measures. Discharge of treated wastewater to the unnamed seasonal stream on site will require an NPDES permit and continued water quality monitoring will be required.</p> <p>The project shall incorporate BMPs for</p>	<p>Mitigation for special status bat species, bald eagles, olive-sided flycatchers, slender-billed white-breasted nuthatches, obtaining an NPDES permit for discharge of treated waters, and BMPs for stormwater runoff would be the same as for Alternative A.</p>	<p>Mitigation for special status bat species, bald eagles, olive-sided flycatchers, slender-billed white-breasted nuthatches, obtaining an NPDES permit for discharge of treated waters, and BMPs for stormwater runoff would be the same as for Alternative A.</p>	<p>Mitigation for special status bat species, bald eagles, olive-sided flycatchers, slender-billed white-breasted nuthatches, and BMPs for stormwater runoff would be the same as for Alternative A.</p>	<p>Mitigation for special status bat species, olive-sided flycatchers, slender-billed white-breasted nuthatches, and BMPs for stormwater runoff would be the same as for Alternative A.</p>	NA

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<p><i>stormwater runoff, including vegetated swales and runoff infiltration devices to ensure that the water quality and quantity in the on-site streams does not change. Stormwater runoff from the project site shall be monitored according to BMPs to assess the quality of water leaving the project site.</i></p> <p><i>If construction is schedule to occur between January 15 and August 1, a biologist shall conduct a survey for active bald eagle nests located within 0.5 miles of the project site. If bald eagles are observed in the immediate project area during the construction period, the Tribe shall contact the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to determine whether further consultation is necessary.</i></p> <p><i>Vegetation removal activities shall occur outside of the nesting season for the olive-sided flycatcher, and the slender-billed white-breasted nuthatch or a pre-construction survey</i></p>					

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<i>for active olive-sided flycatcher, and slender-billed white-breasted nuthatch nests within proposed disturbance areas shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within one week prior to vegetation removal.</i>					
<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	N/A
<i>Migratory Birds</i>	<i>Migratory bird nests could be affected by vegetation removal associated with project construction during the nesting season. - PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -S</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -S</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -S</i>	<i>Development of this alternative would mean the loss of a small amount of stopover/foraging habitat for migrating Canada geese. -LS</i>	NE
	<i>Permanent features associated with the facilities, such as night lighting, may potentially impact migratory bird species. -S</i>				<i>Permanent features associated with the facilities, such as night lighting, may potentially impact migratory bird species. -S</i>	
<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Vegetation removal activities shall occur outside of the nesting season for migratory birds or a pre-construction survey for active migratory bird nests within proposed disturbance areas shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within one week prior to vegetation removal. If occupied nest are</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	NA

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<p><i>found, construction will be delayed until birds have fledged.</i></p> <p><i>Lighting shall optimize the use of downward directed low-pressure sodium lighting and no strobe lighting shall be utilized.</i></p>					
After Mitigation	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	N/A
Waters of U.S.	<p><i>This alternative would significantly affect approximately 0.038 acres of jurisdictional waters of the U.S and change the Type 5 on-site stream from a seasonal stream to a perennial stream. –S</i></p>	<p><i>This alternative would significantly affect approximately 8.41 acres of jurisdictional waters of the U.S and change the Type 5 on-site stream from a seasonal stream to a perennial stream. –S</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –S</i></p>	<p><i>This alternative would significantly affect approximately 0.44 acres of jurisdictional roadside ditches and 0.03 acres of Category 4 Wetlands. –S</i></p>	<p><i>This alternative would significantly affect approximately 24.56 acres of jurisdictional waters of the U.S. –S</i></p>	NE
Mitigation	<p><i>A permit shall be obtained from the USACE prior to any discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S.</i></p> <p><i>The project shall incorporate BMPs for stormwater runoff, including vegetated swales and runoff infiltration devices to ensure that the water quality and quantity in the on-site streams does not change. Stormwater runoff from</i></p>	<p><i>Palustrine wetlands on the northern boundary of the north parcel will be replaced at a ratio determined by the CCWPO.</i></p> <p><i>Additional mitigation with regards to obtaining a USACE permit for discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S, incorporation of BMPs for stormwater run-off, and installation of temporary fencing around wetlands would</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i></p>	<p><i>A USACE verification of the wetland delineation for the site shall be obtained.</i></p> <p><i>Additional mitigation with regards to obtaining a USACE permit for discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S, incorporation of BMPs for stormwater run-off, and installation of temporary fencing around wetlands would be the same as for</i></p>	N/A

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<p><i>the project site shall be monitored according to BMPs to assess the quality of water leaving the project site.</i></p> <p><i>Temporary fencing shall be installed around areas of wetland, intermittent drainage and riparian habitat in accordance with the CCWPO.</i></p>	<p><i>be the same as for Alternative A.</i></p>			<p><i>Alternative A.</i></p>	
<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	N/A
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	<p><i>No known historic properties or paleontological resources would be impacted by project development. However, the potential exists for previously unknown archaeological or paleontological resources to be encountered during construction activities. -PS</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -PS</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -PS</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -PS</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -PS</i></p>	NE
<i>Mitigation</i>	<p><i>In the event of any inadvertent discovery of cultural or paleontological resources, all ground disturbance shall cease until a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist can assess the discovery and make appropriate</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i></p>	N/A

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<p><i>recommendations. If human remains are discovered during ground-disturbing activities on Tribal lands, the Tribal Official and Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) representative shall be contacted immediately.</i></p>					
<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	N/A
Socioeconomics						
<i>Construction Impacts</i>	<p><i>Approximately 4,011 jobs would be generated over the entire construction period with an average wage of \$46,200 and a total payroll of \$185,292,000. –BE</i></p>	<p><i>would be the same as for Alternative A. –BE</i></p>	<p><i>Approximately 2,272 jobs would be generated over the entire construction period with an average wage of \$46,200 and a total payroll of \$104,965,000. –BE</i></p>	<p><i>Approximately 999 jobs would be generated over the entire construction period with an average wage of \$46,200 and a total payroll of \$46,170,000. –BE</i></p>	<p><i>Approximately 2,904 jobs would be generated over the entire construction period with an average wage of \$46,200 and a total payroll of \$134,143,000. –BE</i></p>	NE
<i>Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>After Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Operational Impacts</i>	<p><i>Expected employment of 3,151 employees with an average wage of \$28,000 and a total annual payroll of \$88,135,000. Approximately 90% of employees are anticipated to currently reside in Clark and</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –BE</i></p>	<p><i>Expected employment for 2,156 employees with an average wage of \$28,000 and a total annual payroll of \$60,293,000. Approximately 90% of employees are anticipated to currently reside in Clark and</i></p>	<p><i>Expected employment for 2,991 employees with an average wage of \$49,000 and a total annual payroll of \$146,605,000. The number of employees that would already reside in Clark and Cowlitz counties depends on the businesses that choose to occupy the business park,</i></p>	<p><i>Expected employment for 3,095 employees with an average wage of \$28,000 and a total annual payroll of \$86,580,000. Approximately 90% of employees are anticipated to currently reside in</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative project sites may be developed with industrial or commercial uses.</i></p>

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<i>Cowlitz counties. –BE</i>		<i>Cowlitz counties. –BE</i>	<i>but is anticipated to be within 90% as with the casino. –BE</i>	<i>Clark and Cowlitz counties. –BE</i>	
Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
After Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Local Jurisdictions	<i>Community members would benefit through increased spending and economic opportunities off site, including revenue from the sales tax on construction purchases totaling an estimated \$39,290,000.</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –BE</i>	<i>Community members would benefit through increased spending and economic opportunities off site, including revenue from the sales tax on construction purchases totaling an estimated \$22,257,000.</i>	<i>Community members would benefit from increased spending and economic opportunities off site, including revenue from the sales tax on construction purchases totaling an estimated \$9,790,000.</i>	<i>Community members would benefit through increased spending and economic opportunities off site, including revenue from the sales tax on construction purchases totaling an estimated \$28,444,000. –BE</i>	NE
	<i>Additionally, The Tribe has committed via an MOU with Clark County to make payments to the County and to special funds for the benefit of the community. –BE</i>		<i>Additionally, The Tribe has committed via an MOU with Clark County to make payments to the County and to special funds for the benefit of the community. –BE</i>	<i>Additionally, The Tribe has committed via an MOU with Clark County to collect sales tax on non-Indian sales and to make payments in lieu of property taxes to the County. –BE</i>	<i>The absence of an MOU with Clark County for the Ridgefield Interchange Site means that there is no vehicle for the Tribe to make payments to the County in lieu of property taxes and other lost revenues. –S</i>	
Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>The Tribe shall provide for a new agreement for the Ridgefield Interchange Site, similar to the existing MOU with Clark County, to make payments in lieu of lost revenue and taxes.</i>	N/A

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
<i>After Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	LS	N/A
<i>Property Values</i>	<i>Negative value impacts to nearby properties could occur to the extent they are affected by any noise, traffic, shadow, lights, or glare generated by this alternative. However, while only minimal indirect and growth-inducing impacts are expected, such impacts and the accompanying pressure to convert agricultural land to the service economy may result in increased values for undeveloped land. –BE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –BE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –BE</i>	<i>Negative value impacts to nearby properties would not occur under this alternative as the area is already designated for future urban/industrial development, including business park uses. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –BE</i>	NE
<i>Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>After Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	NA	N/A	N/A
<i>Existing Indian Casino Gaming Market</i>	<i>There are two Indian casinos within 100 miles of the La Center Interchange Site. These two casinos are themselves located within 25 miles of other Indian gaming facilities. Overall, there are as many as 28 different tribes operating multiple gaming facilities throughout the Washington and</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	N/A	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	NE

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	Oregon area. Analysis indicates that the market is not approaching saturation. -LS					
Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
After Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of La Center and Port of Ridgefield	This alternative would result in a decline in cardroom business, which would in turn result in as much as a 66% decline in gaming tax revenue to the City of La Center. This may impact the City's discretionary funding of capital improvement projects for public facilities. -PS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -S	The loss to City gaming tax revenues from a decline in cardroom business would be approximately 44%. This may impact the City's discretionary funding of capital improvement projects for public facilities. -PS	Due to competitive effects, the business center proposed under this alternative could result in some reduction of space rental prices or increased vacancy rates. However, since the business center would have no advantages in competing with the Port of Ridgefield, and suffer from a number of disadvantages, detrimental effects to the Port of Ridgefield are unlikely. -LS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -PS	NE
	Significant impacts are not expected for businesses located in the Port of Ridgefield as the industrial park businesses serve different purposes than this alternative. -LS		Impacts for businesses located in the Port of Ridgefield are the same as Alternative A. -LS			
Mitigation	The Tribe shall establish a fund, through an escrow account or other means, adequate to replace revenues lost by the City of La Center due to	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	N/A	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	N/A

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<i>reduced taxes received from the existing card rooms and make this fund available to the City of La Center for at least 10 years.</i>					
<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	LS	LS	N/A	LS	N/A
<i>Impacts to Spirit Mountain</i>	<i>With increased competition, existing casinos will likely be placed in the position of needing to refine marketing and promotion programs aimed at retaining existing patrons. However, Alternative A could potentially operate without significant adverse effects to existing operations of the Spirit Mountain facility. - LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	<i>As there would be no gaming under this alternative, there are no anticipated competitive effects to gaming facilities. - NE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	NE
<i>Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>After Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Social Effects – Problem and Pathological Gambling/Crime Rates and Bankruptcy</i>	<i>The presence of four existing card clubs in La Center indicates that gambling is already an established enterprise within the local community. This alternative would not introduce a new “problem.” Nonetheless, the Tribe</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	N/A	<i>The presence of four existing card clubs in La Center indicates that gambling is already an established enterprise within the local community. This alternative would not introduce a new “problem.” Nonetheless, the Tribe</i>	NE

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<i>is concerned about the potential social and economic costs associated with pathological gamblers. Therefore, the Tribe has agreed in the MOU with Clark County to contribute no less than \$50,000 per year to compensate these service programs. -LS</i>				<i>is concerned about the potential social and economic costs associated with pathological gamblers. -LS</i>	
Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>The Tribe shall contribute no less than \$50,000 annually to a program that treats problem gamblers.</i>	N/A
After Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Community Infrastructure – Schools and Libraries, Parks, Quality of Life	<i>Due to the limited number of employees that are expected to relocate to the project area, impacts to the Ridgefield School District, parks, and local libraries are expected to be minimal. Additionally, the Tribe has agreed in the MOU with the Ridgefield School District to pay school impact fees if the Tribe constructs single- or multi-family housing on land within the District's service area.</i> <i>Significant changes in community character</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	<i>Due to the limited number of employees that are expected to relocate to the project area, impacts to the Ridgefield School District, parks, and local libraries are expected to be minimal. There are no individual impacts after mitigation that would cause significant impacts to development of a parochial high school on N. 65th Avenue.</i> <i>Significant changes in community character and quality of life are not expected as a</i>	NE

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<i>and quality of life are not expected as a comparatively small number of out-of-area new hires are expected with residential settlement distributed over a large area. Additionally, comparison of the marketing demographic for the resort casino with the residential population for the greater La Center/Ridgefield area shows substantial similarities. -LS</i>				<i>comparatively small number of out-of-area new hires are expected with residential settlement distributed over a large area. Additionally, comparison of the marketing demographic for the resort casino with the residential population for the greater La Center/Ridgefield area shows substantial similarities. -LS</i>	
<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>After Mitigation</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>Environmental Justice</i>	<i>There are no low-income or minority populations resident within the affected area. There are no effects to Environmental Justice under this alternative. -NE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -NE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -NE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -NE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -NE</i>	<i>NE</i>
<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>After Mitigation</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
Transportation	<p>This alternative would add up to 16,714 weekday daily trips to the circulation network and up to 19,574 daily trips on Saturday. -S</p> <p>Seven (7) intersections would operate below level of service (LOS) D during AM, PM, and Saturday peak hours. -S</p> <p>The Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT) has determined that the La Center and Ridgefield interchanges are part of a High Accident Corridor due to traffic backups onto the I-5 mainline. -S</p> <p>Peak hour trips generated on days with special events at the proposed resort and casino have the potential to reduce levels of service of northbound segments of I-5 and I-205. Improvements are planned to these facilities that would improve levels of service substantially over existing conditions. Physical mitigation for</p>	<p>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -S</p>	<p>This alternative would add up to 10,780 weekday daily trips to the circulation network and up to 13,365 daily trips on Saturday. -S</p> <p>Seven (7) intersections would operate below LOS D during AM, PM, and Saturday peak hours. -S</p> <p>WSDOT has determined that the La Center and Ridgefield interchanges are part of a High Accident Corridor due to traffic backups onto the I-5 mainline. - S</p> <p>Peak hour trips generated on days with special events at the proposed resort and casino have the potential to reduce levels of service of northbound segments of I-5 and I-205. Physical mitigation would interfere with planned roadway improvements to these facilities. -PS</p> <p>Coincidentally scheduled events at the Cowlitz Casino and the Clark County Amphitheater would only occur</p>	<p>This alternative would add up to 16,829 weekday daily trips to the circulation network and 2,865 daily trips on Saturday. S</p> <p>Seven (7) intersections would operate below LOS D during AM, PM, and Saturday peak hours. -S</p> <p>WSDOT has determined that the La Center and Ridgefield interchanges are part of a High Accident Corridor due to traffic backups onto the I-5 mainline. - S</p>	<p>This alternative would add up to 17,400 weekday daily trips to the circulation network and up to 19,900 daily trips on Saturday.</p> <p>Eight (8) intersections would operate below LOS D during AM, PM, and Saturday peak hours. -S</p> <p>Peak hour trips generated on days with special events at the proposed resort and casino have the potential to reduce levels of service of northbound segments of I-5 and I-205. Physical mitigation would interfere with planned roadway improvements to these facilities. -PS</p> <p>Coincidentally scheduled events at the Cowlitz Casino and the Clark County Amphitheater would only occur approximately 3-4 times a year. The increased traffic congestion at these times would not be pronounced and LOS D would be maintained on I-5 between 179th Street</p>	NE

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<p>short term impacts would interfere with these planned roadway improvements. –PS</p> <p>Coincidentally scheduled events at the Cowlitz Casino and the Clark County Amphitheater would only occur approximately 3-4 times a year. The increased traffic congestion at these times would not be pronounced and LOS D would be maintained on I-5 between 179th Street and I-205. –LS</p> <p>This alternative would impact fire response from the La Center area fire stations responding to calls west of I-5 using NW 319th Street, resulting in delays to response times during weekday and event-time peaks. –S</p>		<p>approximately 3-4 times a year. The increased traffic congestion at these times would not be pronounced and LOS D would be maintained on I-5 between 179th Street and I-205. –LS</p> <p>This alternative would impact fire response from the La Center area fire stations responding to calls west of I-5 using NW 319th Street, resulting in delays to response times during weekday and event-time peaks. –S</p>		<p>and I-205. –LS</p> <p>This alternative would directly impact the Fire District 12 station on N. 65th Avenue. Delays due to additional site-bound traffic on 65th Avenue will be at LOS C in an unsignalized condition during the site peak hours. –LS</p>	
Mitigation	<p>Pursuant to the MOU with Clark County, the Tribe shall make roadway and intersection improvements to maintain traffic LOS at existing levels for each phase of the project and shall ensure that the LOS does not operate</p>	<p>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</p>	<p>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</p>	<p>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</p>	<p>The Tribe will encourage carpooling and bus use to the project site on events nights. Shuttles running from points in west and east Vancouver, and potentially a site or two in Portland, Oregon, will help to reduce traffic impacts, including</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<p><i>below LOS D for intersection delay during the peak traffic hours. The Tribe will encourage carpooling and bus use to the project site on events nights. Shuttles running from points in west and east Vancouver, and potentially a site or two in Portland, Oregon, will help to reduce traffic impacts, including impacts to key segments of I-5 and I-205.</i></p> <p><i>Additional specific recommended mitigation measures for each intersection are identified in Section 5.2.7.</i></p>				<p><i>impacts to key segments of I-5 and I-205.</i></p> <p><i>The Tribe shall construct improvements at the I-5 and Ridgefield Interchange as recommended in Section 5.2.7.</i></p> <p><i>An optional mitigation measure for the Tribe includes contributing a proportionate share to the City of Ridgefield's future, partially-funded project to reconstruct the I-5 Interchange to a single-point urban interchange (SPUI).</i></p> <p><i>Alternatively, the Tribe could contribute a proportionate share to the City of Ridgefield's planned project at Pioneer and 45th Avenue.</i></p>	
<i>After Mitigation</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>N/A</i>

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
Land Use						
<i>Land Use</i>	<p><i>Alternative A is generally inconsistent with adopted and proposed Clark County land use plans for the project site. Environmental effects resulting from this inconsistency would be avoided through implementation of mitigation measures identified for public services, traffic, air quality, noise, and aesthetics. Additionally, Alternative A would be developed in a manner consistent with specific Clark County codes and ordinances as outlined in Section 10.0 of the MOU with Clark County.</i></p> <p><i>In the long term, Alternative A would be generally compatible with surrounding land uses as the project area has been planned for increased urbanization with light industrial development. -LS</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative E is generally inconsistent with adopted City of Ridgefield land use plans for the project site. Environmental effects resulting from this inconsistency would be avoided through implementation of mitigation measures identified for public services, traffic, air quality, noise, and aesthetics.</i></p> <p><i>In the long term, Alternative E would be generally compatible with surrounding land uses as the project area has been planned for urbanization with office and business park development. -LS</i></p>	<p><i>NE</i></p>
<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>After Mitigation</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
<i>Agriculture</i>	<i>This alternative would convert approximately 98.4 acres of land suitable for agricultural development, which represents approximately 0.001% of the farmland in Clark County. However, the County has already planned for future industrial-urban development on this property. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>This alternative would convert approximately 110.0 acres of land suitable for agricultural development, which represents approximately 0.001% of the farmland in Clark County. However, the County has already planned for future urban development on this property. –LS</i>	<i>NE</i>
<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>After Mitigation</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Public Services						<i>NE</i>
<i>Water Supply</i>	<i>Clark Public Utilities (CPU) has the supply and pressure capabilities to serve this alternative and has agreed to supply water pursuant to a service agreement letter. At peak day demand, this alternative would use approximately 765,000 gallons per day (gpd) from CPU (about 2.8% of CPU's pumping capacity). Construction of a 750,000-gallon closed-tank reservoir on-site would ensure adequate fire flows.</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>CPU has the supply and pressure capabilities to serve this alternative and has agreed to supply water pursuant to a service agreement letter. At peak day demand, this alternative would use approximately 560,000 gpd from CPU (about 2.1% of CPU's pumping capacity). Construction of a 750,000-gallon closed-tank reservoir would ensure adequate fire flows. This reservoir is part of the project design and</i>	<i>CPU has the supply and pressure capabilities to serve this alternative and has agreed to supply water pursuant to a service agreement letter. At peak day demand, this alternative would use approximately 50,000 gpd from CPU (about 0.2% of CPU's pumping capacity). However, an on-site closed tank reservoir with a capacity of at least 120,000 gallons would be required to ensure adequate fire flows of 2,500 gpm for 2 hours.</i>	<i>At peak day demand, this alternative would use approximately 739,000 gpd from CPU (about 2.7% of CPU's pumping capacity). CPU has the supply and pressure capabilities to serve this alternative. However, there is no existing agreement to contract for water services at this location. –PS</i>	

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<i>This reservoir is part of the project design and would be located within the on-site WWTP. -LS</i>		<i>would be located within the on-site WWTP. -LS</i>	-PS		
Mitigation	<i>Recycled water use shall be maximized to the extent feasible.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Construct an on-site closed tank reservoir with a capacity of at least 120,000 gallons.</i>	<i>The Tribe shall enter into negotiations with CPU to contract for water service similar in intent and scope to the agreement made for the La Center Interchange Site.</i>	N/A
	<i>Optional mitigation measures would be to construct on-site water wells for potable water supply, or to contract for water services with the City of Ridgefield.</i>			<i>An optional mitigation measure would be to construct on-site water wells for potable water supply or contract for water services with the City of Ridgefield.</i>	<i>An optional mitigation measure would be to contract for water services with the City of Ridgefield.</i>	
After Mitigation	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	N/A
Wastewater	<i>In accordance with the MOU with Clark County, the Tribe would provide on-site sewage conveyance, treatment, and disposal through development of a new, independent sewage treatment plant, which would meet or exceed Federal and State standards. -LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	<i>No on-site wastewater treatment plant is proposed. The peak demand would represent 8.8% of treatment capacity for the City of La Center. Current infrastructure in La Center is insufficient to handle this capacity and there are no agreements in place to obtain wastewater service from La Center. -S</i>	<i>This alternative would utilize the City of Ridgefield's municipal wastewater system. The Tribe would enter into a service agreement with the City of Ridgefield and pay user and development fees for service. Average flows from this alternative are approximately 293,000 gpd, which is over the capacity of the current municipal treatment plant. Current infrastructure in Ridgefield is insufficient to handle this capacity,</i>	NE

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
					and there are no agreements in place to obtain wastewater service from Ridgefield. -S	
Mitigation	An optional mitigation measure would be to obtain a services agreement with the City of La Center to provide for off-site disposal of wastewater.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	The Tribe should obtain a services agreement with the City of La Center to provide for off-site disposal of wastewater.	The Tribe should obtain a services agreement with the City of Ridgefield to provide for off-site disposal of wastewater.	N/A
After Mitigation	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	N/A
Solid Waste Service	The solid waste from this alternative would represent approximately 5,236 tons per year (tpy) or 0.9% of Finley Buttes Landfill's annual intake. This is not a significant impact to either the daily or annual intake capacity of the landfill. -LS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS	The solid waste from this alternative would represent approximately 3,881 tpy or 0.6% of Finley Buttes Landfill's annual intake. This is not a significant impact to either the daily or annual intake capacity of the landfill. -LS	The solid waste from this alternative would represent approximately 3,589 to 5,085 tpy or 0.9% of Finley Buttes Landfill's annual intake. This is not a significant impact to either the daily or annual intake capacity of the landfill. -LS	The solid waste from this alternative would be similar to the 0.9% annual intake anticipated under Alternatives A and B. This is not a significant impact to either the daily or annual intake capacity of the landfill. -LS	NE
Mitigation	Construction waste shall be recycled, and environmentally preferable materials shall be selected, to the fullest extent practicable. A solid waste management plan shall be adopted by the Tribe that addresses recycling	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	N/A

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<i>and solid waste reduction on site.</i>					
<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	N/A
<i>Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications</i>	<i>CPU has indicated that they have extra generation capacity available. However, to serve this alternative adequately, a new substation would be needed as well as new transmission and feeder lines. -S</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -S</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -S</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -S</i>	<i>The nearest substation to this alternative is within 1 mile. Electricity would be routed to the site from the substation, then transferred and divided by private transformers on site. CPU would charge the Tribe based on the percentage of load used from the substation. No upgrades to CPU's infrastructure would be required under this alternative. -LS</i>	NE
	<i>NW Natural is currently planning on extending service to the vicinity of the La Center Interchange Site due to projected commercial and industrial demands in the area. The cost to the Tribe of extending service is based on a cost benefit analysis of the improvement. -LS</i>				<i>NW Natural has gas lines adjacent to the Ridgefield Interchange site. The cost to the Tribe of extending service onto the site is based on a cost benefit analysis of the improvement. -LS</i>	
	<i>Telephone and cable service is available to the site. -LS</i>				<i>Telephone and cable service is available to the site. -LS</i>	
<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>At least three working days prior to construction, the Tribe shall contact the Utility Notification Center. In</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	N/A

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<p><i>response, the utility service providers shall mark or stake the horizontal path of underground facilities, provide information about the facilities, and/or give clearance to dig.</i></p> <p><i>The Tribe and CPU shall enter into negotiations to provide electrical service to the project site. .</i></p> <p><i>Energy conservation BMPs shall be used to the maximum extent feasible.</i></p>					
<i>After Mitigation</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>Law Enforcement</i>	<p><i>Development of this alternative may increase demands on law enforcement through increased population at the site. To address this potential the Tribe has committed to reimburse Clark County and the Sheriff's Office pursuant to provisions in the MOU. -LS</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i></p>	<p><i>Development of this alternative may increase demands on law enforcement through increased population at the site. Until the Tribe negotiates with the Clark County Sheriff's Office to provide services, this impact is significant. Alternatively, the Tribe could contract with the City of Ridgefield Police Department and provide compensation to the Department for</i></p>	<i>N/E</i>

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
Mitigation	<p>The Tribe shall provide traffic control and on-site security for casino operations, and shall adopt a Responsible Alcoholic Beverage Policy.</p> <p>Pursuant to the MOU with Clark County, the Tribe shall enter into an agreement to reimburse the Clark County Sheriff's Office for reasonable costs incurred in conjunction with providing law enforcement, court, and jail services.</p>	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Pursuant to the MOU with Clark County, the Tribe shall enter into an agreement to reimburse the Clark County Sheriff's Office for reasonable costs incurred in conjunction with providing law enforcement, court, and jail services.	<p>additional demands. –S</p> <p>The Tribe shall provide traffic control and on-site security for casino operations, and shall adopt a Responsible Alcoholic Beverage Policy.</p> <p>The Tribe shall negotiate with Clark County Sheriff's Office or City of Ridgefield Police Department to financially compensate the agency for additional demands caused by the operation of the casino-resort.</p>	N/A
After Mitigation	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	N/A
Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Service	<p>Construction activities may introduce potential sources of fire to the site and operation of commercial facilities on the property would create additional risks from fires and add to firefighting and emergency medical responsibilities in the area. However, the Tribe has committed (via the MOU with Clark County) to reimburse Clark County Fire District (CCFD) 12 for</p>	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS	<p>Construction activities may introduce potential sources of fire to the site and operation of commercial facilities on the property would create additional risks from fires and add to firefighting and emergency medical responsibilities in the area. Until the Tribe obtains a service agreement letter from CCFD 12 to provide services, this impact is</p>	N/A

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	costs relating to the provision of fire and emergency medical services. –LS				significant. –S	
Mitigation	During construction, any construction equipment that normally includes a spark arrester shall be equipped with an arrester in good working order. The Tribe shall use fire-resistant construction materials for the larger buildings and create and maintain a facility equipped with the latest early detection systems that insure an initial response to any fire alarm. The Tribe shall enter into an agreement to reimburse CCFD 12 pursuant to the MOU with Clark County.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A. An on-site closed tank reservoir with a capacity of at least 120,000 gallons shall be required to ensure adequate fire flows.	The Tribe shall negotiate with the appropriate fire department to provide services to compensate the department for additional demands caused by the operation of the facilities.	N/A
After Mitigation	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	N/A
Noise						
Construction Noise	Nighttime construction activities would exceed the WAC Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) level of 47 dBA. –S	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –S	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –S	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –S	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –S	NE

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
Mitigation	Construction using heavy equipment shall not be conducted between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Additional measures to reduce noise from construction equipment shall be maximized.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	N/A
After Mitigation	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	N/A
Operational Noise	On-site operational noise levels would be in compliance with all State limits. -LS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS	NE
Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
After Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hazardous Materials	There are no reported incidents of hazardous materials contamination on the site. There is the potential, however, for hazardous materials spills to occur during construction. - PS The majority of waste produced during operation of the facilities would be non-hazardous. However, operation of the wastewater treatment	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -PS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -PS	There are no reported incidents of hazardous materials contamination on the site. There is the potential, however, for hazardous materials spills to occur during construction. The use, generation, and storage of hazardous materials during the operation of the office/industrial/commercial facilities under this alternative is likely. While	There are no reported incidents of hazardous materials contamination on the site. There is the potential, however, for hazardous materials spills to occur during construction. -PS The majority of waste produced during operation of the facilities would be non-hazardous. However, operation of the emergency backup	NE

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<p><i>plant and emergency backup generators could have a potentially significant impact to the environment and public. –PS</i></p>			<p><i>the impacts would be similar to those of other light industrial operations of this size, there could be a potentially significant impact to the environment and public. –PS</i></p>	<p><i>generators could have a potentially significant impact to the environment and public. –PS</i></p>	
Mitigation	<p><i>In the event that hazardous materials or contamination are encountered during construction, all work shall be halted until a qualified individual can assess the extent of contamination. If contamination is determined to be significant, representatives of the Tribe shall consult with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to determine the appropriate course of action.</i></p> <p><i>Personnel shall follow written standard operating procedures (SOPs) for filling and servicing construction equipment and vehicles.</i></p> <p><i>Hazardous materials necessary for the operation of the facilities shall be stored and handled according to State, Federal, and manufacturers</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation relating to contamination encountered during construction, SOPs, the storing and handling of chemicals, and maintenance and refueling inspections shall be the same as for Alternative A.</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation relating to contamination encountered during construction, SOPs, the storing and handling of chemicals, and maintenance and refueling inspections shall be the same as for Alternative A.</i></p>	N/A

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<p><i>guidelines.</i></p> <p><i>Maintenance and refueling inspections shall occur at regular intervals.</i></p> <p><i>Standard procedures for chemical handling shall be utilized in the wastewater treatment plant building.</i></p>					
<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	N/A
Aesthetics						
<i>Visual Impacts</i>	<p><i>Viewshed B, characterized by mid- to high-end rural residential houses on large lots, would be impacted by the development of this alternative. While development on this site is consistent with long-range County plans for the area, it does represent a major alteration to the viewshed in the short-term. –S</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –S</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –S</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –S</i></p>	<p><i>Viewshed C, characterized by primarily residential and agricultural areas, would be impacted by the development of this alternative. The introduction of commercial facilities on the property is inconsistent with the open space and agricultural character of the area. –S</i></p>	NE
<i>Mitigation</i>	<p><i>Screening features shall be integrated into the landscaping design of the alternatives to screen the view of the facilities from existing residences and to</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i></p>	N/A

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
	<i>integrate natural elements into the design. This includes screening views for residents within a medium range north and west of the site.</i>					
<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	N/A
<i>Shadow and Light</i>	<i>The development of this alternative would introduce new sources of light into an agricultural/rural residential setting. However, through the use of downcast and directed lighting, low-pressure sodium bulbs, and strategically positioned lighting fixtures the impacts of lighting off-site would be minimized. -LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	NE
<i>Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	N/A
<i>Glare</i>	<i>The use of glass panels and reflective detailing would increase the off-site glare. -S</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -S</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -S</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -S</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -S</i>	NE
<i>Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>After Mitigation</i>	S	S	S	S	S	N/A

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	ALTERNATIVE E	NO ACTION
<i>Community Character</i>	<i>Gaming businesses are an established part of the community character of the area. With other anticipated developments in the area and potential UGA expansions by the City of La Center and City of Ridgefield, impacts to community character would be minimal. -LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	<i>This alternative would introduce industrial and commercial elements to the site. However, the area is anticipated for urbanization. With other anticipated developments in the area and potential UGA expansions by the City of La Center and City of Ridgefield, the impacts to community character would be minimal. -LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	<i>NE</i>
<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>After Mitigation</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

Levels of significance are provided before and after mitigation for each effect.

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A