

TACHI PALACE CASINO RESORT EXPANSION PROJECT OFF-RESERVATION ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

ISSUE SUMMARY

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Tachi-Yokut Tribe (Tribe) is considering future expansions of the existing Tachi Palace Casino Resort complex on tribal trust land located in Kings County, approximately 2.75 miles southeast of the City of Lemoore, California. As described in detail in **Section 2.0** of the Tribal Environmental Assessment (TEA), the expanded facilities could include up to approximately 43,518 square feet (sf) of additional gaming floor space, a new 35,000 sf bingo hall/event center, 120-room hotel tower, 20,000 sf conference center, three-story parking garage with 1,000 parking spaces, 1,250 surface parking spaces, and associated infrastructure improvements, including additional on-site water and wastewater treatment facilities (Proposed Project).

Section 10.8 of the current 1999 Tribal-State Gaming Compact (Compact) requires that the Tribe prepare an environmental study prior to commencement of construction or expansion of a gaming facility (casino) on tribal lands that examines off-site impacts. The TEA has been prepared to meet the requirements of Section 10.8 of the Compact and the Tribe's Regulation of the Environment for Class II Gaming, which addresses off-Reservation environmental impacts. The Tribe will use the TEA to determine if the Proposed Project would result in significant off-Reservation impacts to the environment. The scope of the TEA has been focused via the preparation of an Off-Reservation Environmental Impact Analysis Checklist (Checklist; **Appendix A**). The Checklist provides an initial assessment of the potentially significant off-Reservation environmental impacts, and determines which, if any, environmental issues merit further analysis. Potentially significant impacts identified in the Checklist have been evaluated in detail in **Section 3.0** of the TEA.

2.0 PROPOSED PROJECT

The Proposed Project evaluated in the TEA includes potential expansions to the existing Tachi Palace Casino Resort. Expanded and new facilities could accommodate approximately up to an additional 900 gaming devices, and would include an 18,000 sf podium expansion, a new 35,000 sf event center/bingo hall (the current bingo hall would be converted to gaming floor), a new 200-room, 7-story hotel tower with 20,000 sf of conference space, a three story parking garage with 1,000 parking spaces, and a parking

lot with 1,250 parking spaces. Additionally, the Tribe is planning an expansion of the existing Yokut Gas station, including 24 new fuel dispensers (12 gasoline, 12 diesel), expanded on-site convenience store with 60 additional slot machines, and a three-car wash bay. The Proposed Project also includes infrastructure improvements to accommodate the proposed facilities, including expansion of water supply and wastewater treatment facilities (see **Section 2.2.4** and **2.2.5** for additional details). The Proposed Project would employ an estimated 100 additional employees. A site plan for the proposed facilities is presented as **Figure 4. Table 2-1** provides a breakdown of project components with associated square footages. As with the existing facility, the Proposed Project would be constructed to meet the applicable building code requirements of the Compact. This would include meeting or exceeding the requirements of the International Building Code (IBC).

3.0 OFF-RESERVATION ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

I. AESTHETICS

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage off-reservation scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views of historic buildings or views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

See Section 3.2, Aesthetics.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

A-B According to the California Department of Conservation, Important Farmland Finder, APN 024-160-024 is designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance in the 2016 update¹. The remaining APNs are designated as Urban and Built-Up Land and are not considered farmland of importance. Although APN 024-160-024 is designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance, the site currently supports the existing Santa Rosa Rancheria Event center and parking area. Project activities would be limited to the existing footprint of the Tachi Palace Hotel and Casino; no expansion would occur. Therefore, no new impacts to conversion of farmland would occur.

C-D The Site is not zoned for forest land as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), nor is it designated as timberland.

E The Santa Rosa Rancheria Tribal Land is not subject to any land use authority. The 2035 Kings County General Plan states that the County of Kings retains land use authority and jurisdiction over all territories within the county except for four incorporated cities and two federal territories, one of which includes the Santa Rosa Rancheria Tribal land². Currently the following APNs are identified in the general plan and zoning district as AG20, 024-160-024, -005, and -006³. The land use designation AG20 represents General Agriculture – 20 acres (North County) in the Kings County General plan and is intended for rural areas reserved for commercial agricultural uses. However, the General plan also states that the Santa Rosa Rancheria Tribal Trust Land is excluded from this designation; Page LU-13 of the 2035 Kings County General Plan.

¹ CA Farmland Conservancy, 2016. *California Important Farmland Finder*. Available online at: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>. Accessed on March 3, 2020.

² 2035 Kings County General Plan, 2010. January 26, 2010. *Land Use Element*. Available online at: <http://www.countyofkings.com/home/showdocument?id=3110>. Accessed on March 3, 2020.

³ Kings County Map Viewer, 2020. Available online at: http://kingscountygis.com/parcel_query/. Accessed on March 3, 2020.

III. AIR QUALITY

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose off-reservation sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors affecting a substantial number of people off-reservation)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

See Section 3.3, Air Quality.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any off-reservation riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish or U.S. Fish and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected off-reservation wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Proposed Project would not have any impact on off-reservation biological resources with the exception of indirect impacts from proposed mitigation (refer to Section 3.11.7), and no off-reservation habitat modifications or impacts will occur as a result of the Proposed Project, because no off-site construction would occur.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any off-reservation human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Proposed Project would not have any impact on off-reservation cultural resources with the exception of indirect impacts from proposed mitigation (refer to Section 3.11.8), as no off-reservation construction will occur.

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

A-B During construction there would be a temporary consumption of energy resources for the movement of equipment and materials. However, the duration would be short term, and the area of construction would be limited to the existing Project site footprint. Construction equipment

would not be left unattended and would thereby limit engine idling times and reduce short-term energy demand during the project’s construction. There are no unusual project characteristics or construction processes that would require the use of equipment that would be more energy intensive than if used for comparable activities. Construction activities would utilize equipment conformed to current emissions standards and related fuel efficiencies. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would meet the building and safety codes of the Tribe as outlined in the September 1999 Tribal-State Compact between the State of California and the Santa Rosa Rancheria⁴. The Tribe would amend its existing building and safety codes to meet the standards of the building and safety codes of the Uniform Building Codes in effect provided that nothing confers with the jurisdiction upon any county or the State with respect to any reference to such building and safety codes. Construction and expansion of facilities would utilized aspects from the California Green Building Standards Code⁵ (CALGreen Code). The 2020 CALGreen Code includes mandatory measures for non-residential development related to site development such as energy efficiency⁶. Additional explanation of impacts related to energy have been further identified and addressed in Sections 3.3, Air Quality and 3.9, Transportation of the Environmental Evaluation.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial off-reservation adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial off-reservation soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

⁴ Source: Santa Rosa Rancheria, 1999. *Tribal-State Compact between the State of California and the Santa Rosa Rancheria*.

⁵ California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 24, Part 11

⁶ Source: CalGreen, 2019. *Guide to the 2019 California Green Building Standards Code*. Available online at: <https://codes.iccsafe.org/content/CAGBSC2019/cover>. Accessed on February 26, 2020.

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Project Soils are comprised of three different soil types according to the February 2020 Soil Resource Report generated using the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service system⁷. These soils are Grangeville fine sandy loam, saline-alkali, partially drained; Kimberlina fine sandy loam, saline-alkali; and Kimberlina saline alkali-Garces complex.

A-B The Proposed Project is not expected to cause off-reservation geological impacts, nor is it expected to result in off-reservation soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

C-E The Proposed Project is limited to construction activities in a previously graded and developed area and would not introduce new hazards or exacerbate any pre-existing conditions. According to the California Supreme Court decision in December of 2015, CEQA does not require an analysis of impacts that existing environmental conditions may have on project's future users or residents unless they exacerbate hazards that are already present; California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, N. S213478⁸. No new hazard would be introduced and project activities would be achieved with potential to lessen any pre-existing risks through advancements in construction techniques and updated geotechnical studies.

F The Proposed Project would not have off-reservation impacts to resources such as paleontological findings. However, there is a potential for indirect impacts from proposed mitigations (refer to Section 3.12.8), as no off-reservation construction will occur.

⁷ Source: USDA, 2020. February 24, 2020. *Custom Soil Resource Report for Kings County, California*. Natural Resources Conservation Service.

⁸ Source: California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 2015. *No. S213478*. Available online at: <https://caselaw.findlaw.com/ca-supreme-court/1721100.html>. Accessed on March 5, 2020.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

See Section 3.4, Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Create a significant hazard to the off-reservation public or the off-reservation environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the off-reservation public or the off-reservation environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed off-reservation school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- A-B See Section 3.5, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.
- C The Project site is not within one quarter-mile of an off-site school. The closest school site is the Central Elementary School, located at 15783 18th Ave, Lemoore, CA 93245, approximately 0.7 miles northwest of the Project site.
- D The Proposed Project is not a site listed for hazardous materials pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5⁹.
- E The Project site is not located within two miles of a public airport. The closest airport is the Hanford Municipal Airport located over nine (9) miles northeast of Tachi Palace & Casino.
- F Project scope does not entail alterations to the existing emergency access routes. Project construction activities would be limited to the existing developed footprint.
- G According to the Cal Fire Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ) Viewer, the Project site is not in a moderate, high, or very high fire hazard severity zone¹⁰.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

⁹ Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control, 2020. *Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List*. Available online at:

https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?page=3&cmd=search&business_name=&main_street_name=&city=&zip=&county=&status=ACT%2CBKLG%2CCOM&branch=&site_type=CSITES%2CFUDS&npl=&funding=&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST+%28CORTESE%29&reporttype=CORTESE&federal_superfund=&state_response=&voluntary_cleanup=&school_cleanup=&operating=&post_closure=&non_operating=&corrective_action=&tiered_permit=&evaluation=&spec_prog=&national_priority_list=&senate=&congress=&assembly=&critical_pol=&business_type=&case_type=&searchtype=&hwmp_site_type=&cleanup_type=&ocieerp=&hwmp=False&permitted=&pc_permitted=&inspections=&complaints=&censustract=&cesdecile=&school_district=&orderby=county. Accessed on March 6, 2020.

¹⁰ Source: Cal Fire, 2020. Fire and Resource Assessment Program. *FHSZ Viewer*. Available online at: <https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/>. Accessed on March 6, 2020.

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

See Section 3.6, Hydrology and Water Quality.

XI. LAND USE

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Implementation of the Proposed Project would not take place outside federal trust land boundaries; therefore, land use designations do not apply and no adverse off-reservation impacts to land use will occur.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known off-reservation mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of an off-reservation locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Implementation of the Proposed Project would not adversely impact any known off-reservation mineral resources, as no off reservation construction will occur.

XIII. NOISE

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Generation of a substantial off-reservation temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of off-reservation excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

See Section 3.7, Noise.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere off-reservation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No substantial off-reservation population increases are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Project, and the Proposed Project will not displace off-reservation housing, as no off-reservation construction will occur.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

See Section 3.8, Public Services regarding the Proposed Project’s impacts on the provision of fire and police protection services. As described in Section 3.11, Socioeconomics, and under Checklist Item XIV, Population and Housing, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to result in a substantial off-reservation population increase within Kings County. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to result in a significantly increased demand for schools or other public facilities that would require the construction of new or expanded facilities. Refer to Checklist Item XVI, Recreation, regarding the Proposed Project’s impacts on public park facilities.

XVI. RECREATION

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing off-reservation neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

A-B The Proposed Project will create an expanded entertainment and recreational opportunity in Kings County. This new opportunity will provide a positive impact to recreational opportunities in the County and would greatly offset any incremental impacts to off-reservation recreational areas resulting from additional employees moving to the area. While the increase in patron trips to the area and the provision of additional overnight accommodations resulting from the Proposed Project may result in an increase in the use of regional recreational facilities such as the North Community Center and the Surf Ranch, the increase would be minor and not sufficient to adversely affect existing recreational facilities or require the construction of new facilities. Project expansion is not expected to have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to an off-reservation geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access for off-reservation responders?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

See Section 3.9, Transportation.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of off-reservation tribal cultural resources, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Proposed Project would have no impact to off-reservation tribal or cultural resources, Project activities are limited to the existing Tachi Palace & Casino footprint. Therefore, questions A-B are not applicable.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, or wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

See Section 3.10, Utilities and Service Systems, Section 2.2.3 Water Supply, and Section 3.6, Hydrology and Water Quality.

XX. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Project site is not in or near a state responsibility area, nor is it classified as a very high fire hazard severity zone. According to the Cal Fire FHSZ Viewer, the site is located within a local responsible area and is not classified as either very high, high, or moderate severity zones¹¹. Therefore, questions A-D are not applicable.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the off-reservation environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

¹¹ Source: Cal Fire, 2020. Fire and Resource Assessment Program. *FHSZ Viewer*. Available online at: <https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/>. Accessed on March 6, 2020.

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable off-reservation? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause (off-reservation) substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

A The Project site is located within the highly developed Tachi Palace & Casino footprint. No expansion of this footprint will occur. The Proposed Project would not have any impact on off-reservation habitat modifications or impacts to plant or animal communities as a result of the Proposed Project, because no off-site construction would occur.

B-C See Sections 3.2 through 3.12 for discussions of cumulative impacts and indirect impacts.