

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**SPOKANE TRIBE OF INDIANS
WEST PLAINS MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SPOKANE TRIBE OF INDIANS WEST PLAINS DEVELOPMENT PROJECT DRAFT EIS

ES.1 – INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has been prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to assess the environmental effects of issuing a two-part determination under Section 20 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA) (Proposed Action), and the subsequent development of the West Plains Casino and Mixed-Use Development by the Spokane Tribe of Indians (Tribe). Under Section 20 of IGRA (25 USC § 2719) gaming on lands acquired in trust by the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) after October 17, 1988 is prohibited, with some exceptions. In this case, gaming on the 145-acre property adjacent to the City of Airway Heights (City) would require that the Secretary make a “two-part determination,” under Section 20(b)(1)(A) that gaming on the property currently held in federal trust on behalf of the Tribe would be (1) in the best interest of the Tribe and (2) not detrimental to the surrounding community (25 U.S.C. § 2719(b)(1)(A)). A Secretarial two-part determination may only be made after consultation with the Tribe and appropriate state and local officials, including officials of other nearby tribes. In addition, Washington’s Governor must concur with the determination before gaming could occur on the property. Compliance with NEPA is also required for approval of the Tribe’s gaming development and management contract by the National Indian Gaming Commission (NIGC), a federal agency, before such contract can go into effect.

For the purpose of this EIS, the BIA serves as the Lead Agency for compliance with NEPA, with the NIGC, Tribe, the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), the City, Spokane County, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and U.S. Department of the Air Force (Air Force) serving as Cooperating Agencies.

ES.2 – PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose for the Proposed Action is to advance the BIA’s “Self Determination” policy of promoting the Tribe’s self-governance capability, and to promote opportunities for economic development and self-sufficiency of the Tribe and its members. The Tribe’s need for the Proposed Action is based on:

- Lack of a reliable income source for the Tribe, which hinders the Tribe’s ability to maintain programs and services necessary to improve the overall condition of the tribal membership;
- Desire to become a completely self-sufficient entity and eliminate grant spending;
- Lack of employment opportunities for tribal members (approximately 47 percent are unemployed);
- Desire to further develop the Tribe’s property adjacent to the City with tribal economic enterprises;
- Potential profitability of Class III gaming in Airway Heights; and

- Desire to re-establish cash reserves to ensure the stability of the Tribe through tough economic times in the future.

ES.3 – SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

The Proposed Action analyzed in this EIS is the issuance of a two-part determination under Section 20 of the IGRA for Class III gaming on 145 acres held in federal trust for the Tribe near the City of Airway Heights, Washington. The foreseeable consequence of this action would be the development of a casino-resort facility with associated support facilities on the property. The alternatives addressed in this EIS, including the No Action/No Development Alternative, are summarized below. The potential adverse environmental effects and applicable mitigation measures relevant to each alternative are presented in **Table ES-1**.

ALTERNATIVE 1 – PROPOSED CASINO AND MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

Alternative 1 consists of the phased construction of a casino-resort facility, parking facilities, 155,145 square feet of retail space, a 10,480-square-foot tribal cultural center, 14,036-square-foot tribal police and fire station, and a 41,633-square-foot two-story commercial building to be constructed on the approximately 145-acre site located immediately west of the City. Under Alternative 1, the gaming component of the facility would consist of approximately 2,500 electronic gaming devices (EGDs), 50 table games, and 10 poker room tables within a 98,442-square-foot gaming floor area. Other facilities within the casino-resort facility include a 300-room hotel, a cafe, a steakhouse, three restaurants, a food court, bars, a convention/banquet area, 96,634 square feet of lifestyle retail located on the southwest side of the casino-resort facility, and a 107,490-square-foot specialty retail box store with direct access to the casino floor. The 300-room hotel would include a fully enclosed 71,719-square-foot indoor swimming pool area, a spa/wellness center, and a fitness center. The hotel tower would not exceed 145 feet above ground level. A four-story concrete parking structure would be located on the west side of the casino-resort facility and would include 1,500 parking spaces. A total of 4,753 surface parking spaces would be provided for Alternative 1.

ALTERNATIVE 2 – REDUCED CASINO AND MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

Alternative 2 consists of the construction of a casino-resort facility, parking facilities, 155,145 square feet of retail space, a 10,480-square-foot tribal cultural center, 14,036-square-foot tribal police and fire station, and a 41,633-square-foot two-story commercial building to be constructed on the approximately 145-acre site. Under Alternative 2, the gaming component of the facility would consist of approximately 1,500 EGDs, 32 table games, and 10 poker room tables within a 61,000 square-foot gaming floor area. Other facilities within the casino-resort facility include a cafe, a steakhouse, a food court, bars, and a 12,600 square-foot multi-purpose bingo room. No hotel or parking structure is proposed under Alternative 2. A total of 4,624 surface parking spaces would be provided for Alternative 2.

ALTERNATIVE 3 – NON-GAMING MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

Under Alternative 3, the overall building program would be similar in size to that of Alternative 1; however, a casino would not be developed. Alternative 3 consists of the construction of a mixed-use

development complex, a 300-room hotel, parking facilities, 155,145 square feet of retail space, a 10,480-square-foot tribal cultural center, 14,036-square-foot tribal police and fire station, and a 41,633-square-foot two-story commercial building to be constructed on the approximately 145-acre site. At build-out the entertainment components would consist of a 55,850-square-foot children's arcade, a 45,202-square-foot bowling alley, and an 8,593-square-foot lounge area. Food facilities within the complex would include a coffee shop, a food court with 10 venues, a steakhouse, 2 specialty restaurants, and a retail restaurant. Other facilities within the complex include a convention/banquet area and a 96,634-square-foot lifestyle retail component located on the southwest side of the complex. As described under Alternative 1, the hotel tower would not exceed 145 feet above ground level and would include a fully enclosed 71,719-square-foot indoor swimming pool area, a spa/wellness center, and a fitness center. A four-story concrete parking structure would be located on the west side of the mixed-use development complex and would include 1,500 parking spaces. A total of 4,753 surface parking spaces would be provided for Alternative 3.

ALTERNATIVE 4 – NO ACTION/NO DEVELOPMENT

Under the No Action/No Development Alternative, none of the three development alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, and 3) considered within this EIS would be implemented. The No Action/No Development Alternative assumes that existing uses on the project site would not change in the near term and that the BIA would not take any actions to promote tribal self-determination and economic development.

ES.4 – AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The BIA published a Notice of Intent (NOI) in the *Federal Register* on August 19, 2009 and August 27, 2009¹, describing the Proposed Action, and announcing the BIA's intent to prepare an EIS (**Appendix B**). The results of the scoping period were made available in a scoping report published by the BIA in March 2011. This report is available for review at <http://www.westplainseis.com/> or upon request to the BIA's Northwest Region Office at 911 NE 11th Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97232. Issues raised during scoping generally fell into the following categories.

- Procedural/NEPA Process
- Alternatives and Purpose and Need
- Land Resources
- Water Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural and Paleontological Resources
- Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice
- Resources Use Patterns
- Public Services
- Noise
- Indirect Effects
- Cumulative Effects

To the extent required by NEPA, this EIS has incorporated the issues and concerns identified during the scoping process.

¹ The NOI published on August 19, 2009 contained incorrect dates for the close of the comment period and public scoping meeting. The NOI published on August 27, 2009 republished the content of the original notice with corrected dates.

ES.5 – SUMMARY MATRIX

The potential adverse and beneficial effects, as well as mitigation measures, relevant to each alternative are presented in **Table ES-1**. For a detailed discussion of environmental consequences and mitigation measures see **Chapters 4.0** and **5.0**.

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

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|--------------------------|--|---|---|-----------|
| Geology and Soils | | | | |
| Topography | Topographic features of the site would be altered by earthwork; however, the project design would preserve the most significant topographic features - LS | Topographic features of the site would be altered by earthwork; however, the project design would preserve the most significant topographic features - LS | Topographic features of the site would be altered by earthwork; however, the project design would preserve the most significant topographic features - LS | NE |
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Soils/Geology | Disturbance of the soils could result in loss of topsoil and a degradation of air quality through wind erosion. - LSM | Disturbance of the soils could result in loss of topsoil and a degradation of air quality through wind erosion. - LSM | Disturbance of the soils could result in loss of topsoil and a degradation of air quality through wind erosion. - LSM | NE |
| Mitigation | An Erosion Control Plan (ECP) that shall identify the locations of erosion control features recommended to direct and filter stormwater runoff shall be created and implemented prior to start of any site disturbance. A General Construction National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit shall be obtained from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under the Federal requirements of the Clean Water Act (CWA). As required by the NPDES permit, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be prepared that addresses potential water quality impacts associated with construction and operation of | An ECP that shall identify the locations of erosion control features recommended to direct and filter stormwater runoff shall be created and implemented prior to start of any site disturbance. A General Construction NPDES permit shall be obtained from the EPA under the Federal requirements of the CWA. As required by the NPDES permit, a SWPPP shall be prepared that addresses potential water quality impacts associated with construction and operation of the project alternatives. Specific BMPs recommended for Alternative 2 are listed in Section 5.2.1 . | An ECP that shall identify the locations of erosion control features recommended to direct and filter stormwater runoff shall be created and implemented prior to start of any site disturbance. A General Construction NPDES permit shall be obtained from the EPA under the Federal requirements of the CWA. As required by the NPDES permit, a SWPPP shall be prepared that addresses potential water quality impacts associated with construction and operation of the project alternatives. Specific BMPs recommended for Alternative 3 are listed in Section 5.2.1 . | |

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|------------------------|--|--|--|-----------|
| | the project alternatives. Specific Best Management Practices (BMPs) recommended for Alternative 1 are listed in Section 5.2.1 . | | | |
| Seismicity | The proposed facilities would not be significantly affected by seismic hazards. - NE | The proposed facilities would not be significantly affected by seismic hazards. - NE | The proposed facilities would not be significantly affected by seismic hazards. - NE | NE |
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Mineral Resources | The development would not adversely affect known or recorded mineral resources. - NE | The development would not adversely affect known or recorded mineral resources. - NE | The development would not adversely affect known or recorded mineral resources. - NE | NE |
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Water Resources | | | | |
| Flooding | The project is not located in a floodplain and thus would not affect floodplain management. - NE | The project is not located in a floodplain and thus would not affect floodplain management. - NE | The project is not located in a floodplain and thus would not affect floodplain management. - NE | NE |
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Construction Impacts | Construction of the project could result in discharges of pollutants to surface waters. - LSM | Construction of the project could result in discharges of pollutants to surface waters. - LSM | Construction of the project could result in discharges of pollutants to surface waters. - LSM | NE |
| Mitigation | Implement mitigation for soils, above. | Implement mitigation for soils, above. | Implement mitigation for soils, above. | NA |
| Stormwater Runoff | All stormwater run-off would be contained within the project site. No discharge to off-site surface waters would occur; therefore, there would be no impact to drainage facilities. - LS | All stormwater run-off would be contained within the project site. No discharge to off-site surface waters would occur; therefore, there would be no impact to drainage facilities. - LS | All stormwater run-off would be contained within the project site. No discharge to off-site surface waters would occur; therefore, there would be no impact to drainage facilities. - LS | NE |

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|--|--|---|---|-----------|
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Groundwater | Detention swales could transport dissolved contaminants into the groundwater through percolation. - LSM | Detention swales could transport dissolved contaminants into the groundwater through percolation. - LSM | Detention swales could transport dissolved contaminants into the groundwater through percolation. - LSM | NE |
| Mitigation | The Tribe has committed in the intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with the City to design stormwater facilities in accordance with the Airway Heights Public Works Standards. See Section 5.2.2 for detailed design components. | The Tribe has committed in the IGA with the City to design stormwater facilities in accordance with the Airway Heights Public Works Standards. See Section 5.2.2 for detailed design components. | The Tribe has committed in the IGA with the City to design stormwater facilities in accordance with the Airway Heights Public Works Standards. See Section 5.2.2 for detailed design components. | NA |
| Air Quality | | | | |
| Construction Emissions | Construction of Alternative 1 would not cause an exceedance of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for criteria air pollutants (CAPs). Emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM) could impact sensitive receptors. - LSM | Construction of Alternative 2 would not cause an exceedance of NAAQS for CAPs. Emissions of DPM could impact sensitive receptors. - LSM | Construction of Alternative 3 would not cause an exceedance of NAAQS for CAPs. Emissions of DPM could impact sensitive receptors. - LSM | NE |
| Mitigation | Specific BMPs to reduce fugitive dust and DPM emissions shall be implemented during construction. Refer to Section 5.2.3 . | Specific BMPs to reduce fugitive dust and DPM emissions shall be implemented during construction. Refer to Section 5.2.3 . | Specific BMPs to reduce fugitive dust and DPM emissions shall be implemented during construction. Refer to Section 5.2.3 . | NA |
| Operational Vehicle and Area Emissions | Estimated mobile and stationary emissions of CAPs from operation of Alternative 1 would not exceed NAAQS. - LS | Estimated mobile and stationary emissions of CAPs from operation of Alternative 2 would not result in significant adverse effects. - LS | Estimated mobile and stationary emissions of CAPs from operation of Alternative 3 would not result in significant adverse effects. - LS | NE |
| Mitigation | Control of diesel powered vehicles | Control of diesel powered vehicles | Control of diesel powered vehicles | NA |

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|-----------|
| | and other BMPs to reduce mobile source emissions listed in Section 5.2.3 would further reduce less than significant effects. | and other BMPs to reduce mobile source emissions listed in Section 5.2.3 would further reduce less than significant effects. | and other BMPs to reduce mobile source emissions listed in Section 5.2.3 would further reduce less than significant effects. | |
| Biological Resources | | | | |
| Habitats | None of the habitats that would be affected by the implementation of Alternative 1 are considered sensitive communities; therefore, no effect would occur. - NE | None of the habitats that would be affected by the implementation of Alternative 2 are considered sensitive communities; therefore, no effect would occur. - NE | None of the habitats that would be affected by the implementation of Alternative 3 are considered sensitive communities; therefore, no effect would occur. - NE | NE |
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Federally Listed Species | No federal listed wildlife species occur within the project site; therefore, no effect to federally listed wildlife would occur. Removal of ornamental landscaping associated with Alternative 1 would remove habitat for the potentially occurring Spalding's silene, a federally listed plant species.- LSM | No federal listed wildlife species occur within the project site; therefore, no effect to federally listed wildlife would occur. Removal of ornamental landscaping associated with Alternative 2 would remove habitat for the potentially occurring Spalding's silene, a federally listed plant species.- LSM | No federal listed wildlife species occur within the project site; therefore, no effect to federally listed wildlife would occur. Removal of ornamental landscaping associated with Alternative 3 would remove habitat for the potentially occurring Spalding's silene, a federally listed plant species.- LSM | NE |
| Mitigation | Conducting an additional focused botanical survey within the blooming season and establishing an avoidance buffer around potential habitat should this species be identified, as described in detail in Section 5.2.4 , would ensure that impacts to Spalding's silene are avoided. | Conducting an additional focused botanical survey within the blooming season and establishing an avoidance buffer around potential habitat should this species be identified, as described in detail in Section 5.2.4 , would ensure that impacts to Spalding's silene are avoided. | Conducting an additional focused botanical survey within the blooming season and establishing an avoidance buffer around potential habitat should this species be identified, as described in detail in Section 5.2.4 , would ensure that impacts to Spalding's silene are avoided. | NA |
| Migratory Birds | Construction of Alternative 1 could result in impacts to species protected under the Migratory Bird | Construction of Alternative 2 could result in impacts to species protected under the MBTA if active | Construction of Alternative 3 could result in impacts to species protected under the MBTA if active nests are | NE |

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|---|---|--|--|-----------|
| Mitigation | Treaty Act (MBTA) if active nests are present within shrubs and/or ornamental trees within the project site. -LSM Conducting a preconstruction survey and removing ornamental trees before the nesting season as described in detail in Section 5.2.4 would prevent impacts to migratory birds. | nests are present within shrubs and/or ornamental trees within the project site. - LSM Conducting a preconstruction survey and removing ornamental trees before the nesting season as described in detail in Section 5.2.4 would prevent impacts to migratory birds. | present within shrubs and/or ornamental trees within the project site. - LSM Conducting a preconstruction survey and removing ornamental trees before the nesting season as described in detail in Section 5.2.4 would prevent impacts to migratory birds. | NA |
| Wetlands and/or Waters of the US | There are no jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. located within the project site. Alternative 1 was designed to avoid vernal wetlands located within the project site, and therefore would have no effect on wetland habitats. - NE | There are no jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. located within the project site. Alternative 2 was designed to avoid vernal wetlands located within the project site, and therefore would have no effect on wetland habitats. - NE | There are no jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. located within the project site. Alternative 3 was designed to avoid vernal wetlands located within the project site, and therefore would have no effect on wetland habitats. - NE | NE |
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Cultural and Paleontological Resources | | | | |
| Cultural Resources (Known Cultural Resources) | The site plan for Alternative 1 completely avoids known cultural resources on the project site; therefore, Alternative 1 would have no effect on known cultural resources. - NE | The site plan for Alternative 2 completely avoids known cultural resources on the project site; therefore, Alternative 2 would have no effect on known cultural resources. - NE | The site plan for Alternative 3 completely avoids known cultural resources on the project site; therefore, Alternative 3 would have no effect on known cultural resources. - NE | NE |
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Cultural Resources (Undiscovered) | Previously unknown cultural resources may be encountered during ground disturbing activities. - LSM | Previously unknown cultural resources may be encountered during ground disturbing activities. - LSM | Previously unknown cultural resources may be encountered during ground disturbing activities. - LSM | NE |

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|---------------------------------|---|---|--|-----------|
| Mitigation | Procedures for post-review discoveries without prior planning pursuant to 36 CFR 800.13 shall be followed as described in Section 5.2.5. | Procedures for post-review discoveries without prior planning pursuant to 36 CFR 800.13 shall be followed as described in Section 5.2.5. | Procedures for post-review discoveries without prior planning pursuant to 36 CFR 800.13 shall be followed as described in Section 5.2.5. | NA |
| Paleontological Resources | Previously unknown paleontological resources could be discovered during earthmoving activities. - LSM | Previously unknown paleontological resources could be discovered during earthmoving activities. - LSM | Previously unknown paleontological resources could be discovered during earthmoving activities. - LSM | NE |
| Mitigation | A qualified paleontologist shall be contacted to evaluate the significance of the find and collect the materials for curation, as appropriate. | A qualified paleontologist shall be contacted to evaluate the significance of the find and collect the materials for curation, as appropriate. | A qualified paleontologist shall be contacted to evaluate the significance of the find and collect the materials for curation, as appropriate. | NA |
| Socioeconomic Conditions | | | | |
| Economic Effects | Under Alternative 1, construction activities are estimated to cost approximately \$404.3 million, which is expected to generate a one-time total output of approximately \$301.9 million within the County. New spending from the proposed project is expected to generate a net annual total output of approximately \$249.3 million within the County during the operation phase. Construction and operation of Alternative 1 would generate substantial output to a variety of businesses in Spokane County, which would stimulate the local economy. - BE | Under Alternative 2, construction activities are estimated to cost approximately \$160.0 million, which is expected to generate a one-time total output of approximately \$121.6 million within the County. Alternative 2 is expected to generate an annual total output of approximately \$147.0 million within the County during the operation phase. Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would generate substantial output to a variety of businesses in Spokane County, which would stimulate the local economy. - BE | Under Alternative 3, construction activities are estimated to cost approximately \$256.1 million, which is expected to generate a one-time total output of approximately \$228.7 million within the County. Alternative 3 is expected to generate an annual total output of approximately \$111.6 million within the County. Construction and operation of Alternative 3 would generate substantial output to a variety of businesses in Spokane County, which would stimulate the local economy. - BE | NE |
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|----------------------|---|--|--|-----------|
| Substitution Effects | The anticipated gaming revenue substitution effect under Alternative 1 would be approximately 32.7 percent of total projected gaming revenue for the project (\$81.2 million); however, anticipated substitution effects would not result in the closure of any of the competing gaming facilities. Substitution effects resulting from Alternative 1 would not impact the ability of the Kalispell or Coeur D'Alene tribal governments to provide essential services and facilities to its membership. It is not anticipated that significant quantifiable non-gaming substitution effects would occur. - LS | The anticipated gaming revenue substitution effect under Alternative 2 would be approximately 22.5 percent of total projected gaming revenue for the project (\$58.6 million); however, anticipated substitution effects would not result in the closure of any of the competing gaming facilities. Substitution effects resulting from Alternative 2 would not impact the ability of the Kalispell or Coeur D'Alene tribal government to provide essential services and facilities to its membership. It is not anticipated that significant quantifiable non-gaming substitution effects would occur. - LS | Alternative 3 would not result in a measurable impact on existing retail businesses in the project area since the proposed retail square-footage would be less than the estimated retail growth opportunity in the region. The substitution effect resulting from Alternative 3, should it occur, would represent a negligible portion of total economic activity that would be generated by its operation. - LS | NE |
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Tax Revenues | Alternative 1 would be constructed on land that is already held in trust by the federal government for the Tribe. Therefore, no property taxes would be lost. Tax revenues would be generated for federal, state and local governments from activities including secondary economic activity generated by tribal gaming. Construction of Alternative 1 would generate one-time \$8.6 million in federal tax revenues, and \$6.6 million in state/county/local tax revenues. Operation of Alternative 1 would generate annually \$6.3 million | Alternative 2 would be constructed on land that is already held in trust by the federal government for the Tribe. Therefore, no property taxes would be lost. Tax revenues would be generated for federal, state and local governments from activities including secondary economic activity generated by tribal gaming. Construction would result in an estimated \$3.4 million in federal tax revenues, and \$2.6 million in state/County/local government tax revenues. Operation of Alternative 2 would result in an estimated \$3.7 | Alternative 3 would be constructed on land that is already held in trust by the federal government for the Tribe. Therefore, no property taxes would be lost. Tax revenues would be generated for federal, state and local governments from activities including secondary economic activity generated by tribal gaming. Construction would result in an estimated \$6.3 million in federal tax revenues, and \$4.9 million in state/County/local government tax revenues. Operation of Alternative 3 would result in an estimated \$2.9 | NE |

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|----------------|---|--|--|---------------------|
| | Spokane County housing market is projected to have 211,307 total units and 14,185 vacant units. Due to the number of anticipated vacant houses in the vicinity of the project, Alternative 1 is not expected to stimulate regional housing development. - LS | fulfill the demands for housing under Alternative 2. Due to the number of vacant houses in the vicinity of the project, Alternative 2 is not expected to stimulate regional housing development. - LS | fulfill the demands for housing under Alternative 3. Due to the number of vacant houses in the vicinity of the project, Alternative 3 is not expected to stimulate regional housing development. - LS | |
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Social Effects | <p>Because four existing casinos are located within 50 miles of the project site, including the existing Northern Quest Casino located approximately two miles from the project site, no increase in problem gambling rates in the local area is anticipated. - LS</p> <p>Alternative 1 would introduce a large number of patrons and employees into the community on a daily basis. As a result, under Alternative 1, criminal incidents would be expected to increase in the project area, particularly at the project site, as with any other development of this size. However, increased tax revenues resulting from Alternative 1 and local agreements between the Tribe, County, and City of Airway Heights would fund expansion of law enforcement services required to accommodate planned growth.</p> | <p>Social impacts including pathological and problem gambling, and crime from Alternative 2 would be comparable but to a lesser extent than Alternative 1, since Alternative 2 is reduced in size and scope. Alternative 2 would not result in significant adverse effects associated with problem gambling or crime. - LS</p> | <p>As no gaming will be developed under Alternative 3, no increase in problem gambling will occur. - LS</p> <p>Alternative 3 would not result in significant adverse effects associated with crime. - LS</p> | <p>NE</p> <p>NA</p> |

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|--|---|---|---|-----------|
| Mitigation | Alternative 1 would not result in significant adverse effects associated with crime. - LS Optional mitigation measures to address problem gambling, including voluntary self-exclusion, are recommended in Section 5.2.6. | Optional mitigation measures to address problem gambling, including voluntary self-exclusion, are recommended in Section 5.2.6. | NA | NA |
| Community Impacts | Due to the limited number of employees that are expected to relocate to the project area, effects on Spokane County's schools, libraries, and parks are expected to be minimal. - LS | Due to the limited number of employees that are expected to relocate to the project area, effects on Spokane County's schools, libraries, and parks are expected to be minimal. - LS | Due to the limited number of employees that are expected to relocate to the project area, effects on Spokane County's schools, libraries, and parks are expected to be minimal. - LS | NE |
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Effects to the Spokane Indian Tribe | Alternative 1 would generate employment opportunities that are expected to benefit Tribal members as well fund necessary tribal member services. - BE | Alternative 2 would not generate a sufficient amount of revenue to fund all essential governmental, social, and other services for the Tribe. - S | Alternative 3 would not generate a sufficient amount of revenue to fund all essential governmental, social, and other services. - S | NE |
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Environmental Justice: Minority and Low-income Communities | No low-income or minority communities were identified in the vicinity of the project site; therefore, Alternative 1 would not result in significant adverse effects to low-income or minority communities. - NE | No low-income or minority communities were identified in the vicinity of the project site; therefore, Alternative 2 would not result in significant adverse effects to low-income or minority communities. - NE | No low-income or minority communities were identified in the vicinity of the project site; therefore, Alternative 3 would not result in significant adverse effects to low-income or minority communities. - NE | NE |
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Transportation | | | | |

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|----------------------|---|--|--|-----------|
| Site Access | Access to the site will be provided by six driveways, three along US-2 and three along Craig Road between US-2 and 6 th Street. The addition of the driveways to the existing roadway could potentially result in circulation and safety impacts. - LSM | Access to the site will be provided by six driveways, three along US-2 and three along Craig Road between US-2 and 6 th Street. The addition of the driveways to the existing roadway could potentially result in circulation and safety impacts. - LSM | Access to the site will be provided by six driveways, three along US-2 and three along Craig Road between US-2 and 6 th Street. The addition of the driveways to the existing roadway could potentially result in circulation and safety impacts. - LSM | NE |
| Mitigation | Improvements to the access intersections to manage safe ingress and egress of traffic at the project site have been recommended as a result of the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and Addendum (Appendix D) and are included as mitigation in Section 5.2.7 | Improvements to the access intersections to manage safe ingress and egress of traffic at the project site have been recommended as a result of the TIA and Addendum (Appendix D) and are included as mitigation in Section 5.2.7 | Improvements to the access intersections to manage safe ingress and egress of traffic at the project site have been recommended as a result of the TIA and Addendum (Appendix D) and are included as mitigation in Section 5.2.7 | NA |
| Construction Traffic | Construction activity impacts would be concentrated on US-2 in the immediate vicinity of the project site, and would include temporary traffic delays due to slower moving construction trucks and the increase in worker vehicles on area roadways. Because construction traffic would be temporary, significantly less than operational traffic, and would occur outside of the peak hour, within mitigation significant adverse effects would not occur. - LSM | Construction related traffic impacts would be similar to Alternative 1. Because construction traffic would be temporary, significantly less than operational traffic, and would occur outside of the peak hour, with mitigation significant adverse effects would not occur. - LSM | Construction related traffic impacts would be similar to Alternative 1. Because construction traffic would be temporary, significantly less than operational traffic, and would occur outside of the peak hour, with mitigation significant adverse effects would not occur. - LSM | NE |
| Mitigation | During construction of Alternative 1, the Tribe will comply with all Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT) | During construction of Alternative 2, the Tribe will comply with all WSDOT requirements for work within federal and state rights-of- | During construction of Alternative 3, the Tribe will comply with all WSDOT requirements for work within federal and state rights-of-way, including the | NA |

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|-----------|
| Mitigation | <p>Because sufficient parking is available onsite and sidewalk and bicycle facilities do not provide direct access to the project site, no significant effects would occur to pedestrian facilities as a result of Alternative 1. - LS</p> <p>To further reduce less than significant effects to transit and pedestrian facilities, the Tribe shall work with STA to provide additional public transportation opportunities and shall implement and/or pay a fair share contribution to pedestrian and transit facility improvements detailed in Section 5.2.7 (J).</p> | <p>Because sufficient parking is available onsite and sidewalk and bicycle facilities do not provide direct access to the project site, no significant effects would occur to pedestrian facilities as a result of Alternative 2. - LS</p> <p>To further reduce less than significant effects to transit and pedestrian facilities, the Tribe shall work with STA to provide additional public transportation opportunities and shall implement and/or pay a fair share contribution to pedestrian and transit facility improvements detailed in Section 5.2.7 (J).</p> | <p>sufficient parking is available onsite and sidewalk and bicycle facilities do not provide direct access to the project site, no significant effects would occur to pedestrian facilities as a result of Alternative 3. - LS</p> <p>To further reduce less than significant effects to transit and pedestrian facilities, the Tribe shall work with STA to provide additional public transportation opportunities and shall implement and/or pay a fair share contribution to pedestrian and transit facility improvements detailed in Section 5.2.7 (J).</p> | NA |
| Land Use | | | | |
| Existing and Planned Land Uses | <p>Alternative 1 is compatible with nearby existing and planned land uses. Although state and local land use plans do not apply to tribal lands, Alternative 1 would be compatible with local zoning and land use policies as well as policies related to land use in the vicinity of the Fairchild Air Force Base (AFB) and Spokane International Airport (SIA). - LSM</p> | <p>Alternative 2 is compatible with nearby existing and planned land uses. Although state and local land use plans do not apply to tribal lands, Alternative 2 would be compatible with local zoning and land use policies as well as policies related to land use in the vicinity of the Fairchild AFB and SIA. - LSM</p> | <p>Alternative 3 is compatible with nearby existing and planned land uses. Although state and local land use plans do not apply to tribal lands, Alternative 3 would be compatible with local zoning and land use policies as well as policies related to land use in the vicinity of the Fairchild AFB and SIA. – LSM</p> | NE |
| Mitigation | <p>Mitigation measures to address compatibility issues associated with potential nuisances that may be caused by AFB operations are recommended in Section 5.2.8,</p> | <p>Mitigation measures to address compatibility issues associated with potential nuisances that may be caused by AFB operations are recommended in Section 5.2.8 and</p> | <p>Mitigation measures to address compatibility issues associated with potential nuisances that may be caused by AFB operations are recommended in Section 5.2.8,</p> | NA |

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|---------------------|---|--|--|-----------|
| Mitigation | <p>Phase II expansion of their Wastewater Treatment, Reclamation, and Recharge Facility (WTRRF) is operational. The City has agreed to supply wastewater treatment services pursuant to the IGA between the City, Spokane County, and the Tribe. With implementation of the conditions of the IGA, no significant effects to the City's public sewer and wastewater treatment system and level of service would occur as a result of Alternative 1. - LS</p> <p>In accordance with the IGA, the Tribe shall pay the current sewer capital connection charge and monthly service fees for sewer service as established by City Council Resolution and Ordinance.</p> | <p>Phase II expansion of their WTRRF is operational. The City has agreed to supply wastewater treatment services pursuant to the IGA between the City, Spokane County, and the Tribe. With implementation of the conditions of the IGA, no significant effects to the City's public sewer and wastewater treatment system and level of service would occur as a result of Alternative 2. - LS</p> <p>In accordance with the IGA, the Tribe shall pay the current sewer capital connection charge and monthly service fees for sewer service as established by City Council Resolution and Ordinance.</p> | <p>II expansion of their WTRRF is operational. The City has agreed to supply wastewater treatment services pursuant to the IGA between the City, Spokane County, and the Tribe. With implementation of the conditions of the IGA, no significant effects to the City's public sewer and wastewater treatment system and level of service would occur as a result of Alternative 3. - LS</p> <p>In accordance with the IGA, the Tribe shall pay the current sewer capital connection charge and monthly service fees for sewer service as established by City Council Resolution and Ordinance.</p> | NA |
| Solid Waste Service | <p>The Tribe will contract with Sunshine Disposal and Recycling, Inc (Sunshine Disposal) for solid waste collection service. The Spokane Regional Solid Waste System (SRSWS) transfer stations and disposal facilities have the capacity to serve Alternative 1; therefore, the construction and operation of Alternative 1 would not result in significant adverse effects on solid waste services. - LS</p> | <p>The Tribe will contract with Sunshine Disposal for solid waste collection service. The SRSWS transfer stations and disposal facilities have the capacity to serve Alternative 2; therefore, the construction and operation of Alternative 2 would not result in significant adverse effects on solid waste services. - LS</p> | <p>The Tribe will contract with Sunshine Disposal for solid waste collection service. The SRSWS transfer stations and disposal facilities have the capacity to serve Alternative 3; therefore, the construction and operation of Alternative 3 would not result in significant adverse effects on solid waste services. - LS</p> | NE |
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|--|--|---|---|-----------|
| Law Enforcement | The Airway Heights Police Department (AHPD) would not need any additional facilities or equipment to meet the increased need for services under Alternative 1; however, the City would experience increased costs associated with demand for additional law enforcement services. With implementation of the conditions of the MOA, development of Alternative 1 would not result in significant effects on public law enforcement services. - LSM | The AHPD would not need any additional facilities or equipment to meet the increased need for services under Alternative 2; however, the City would experience increased costs associated with demand for additional law enforcement services. With implementation of the conditions of the MOA, development of Alternative 2 would not result in significant effects on public law enforcement services. - LSM | The AHPD would not need any additional facilities or equipment to meet the increased need for services under Alternative 3; however, the City would experience increased costs associated with demand for additional law enforcement services. With implementation of an agreement between the Tribe and the City of Airway Heights for law enforcement services, development of Alternative 3 would not result in significant effects on law enforcement services. - LSM | NE |
| Mitigation | Payments by the Tribe intended to compensate the City for costs of increased services are given in the MOA. In addition, the Tribe shall provide on-site security and assist the City in law enforcement to the extent allowable under the law. | Payments by the Tribe intended to compensate the City for costs of increased services are given in the MOA. In addition, the Tribe shall provide on-site security and assist the City in law enforcement to the extent allowable under the law. | The Tribe shall enter into an agreement with the City to compensate for costs of increased services, similar to those listed within the MOA. In addition, the Tribe shall provide on-site security and assist the City in law enforcement to the extent allowable under the law. | NA |
| Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services | The Airway Heights Fire Department (AHFD) would not need any additional facilities or equipment to meet the increased need for services under Alternative 1; however, the City would experience increased costs associated with additional fire protection and emergency medical services. With implementation of the conditions of the MOA, development of | The AHFD would not need any additional facilities or equipment to meet the increased need for services under Alternative 2; however, the City would experience increased costs associated with additional fire protection and emergency medical services. With implementation of the conditions of the MOA, development of Alternative 2 would not result in | The AHFD would not need any additional facilities or equipment to meet the increased need for services under Alternative 3; however, the City would experience increased costs associated with additional fire protection and emergency medical services. With implementation of an agreement between the Tribe and the City of Airway Heights for fire protection services, development of | NE |

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|-----------|
| Mitigation | <p>Alternative 1 would not result in significant effects on AHFD. The increase in traffic through Fire District 10 – West Plains District as a result of Alternative 1 could significantly increase District’s call volume. The Tribe shall provide fair-share assistance to District 10 through the existing mechanism established within Section XIV, Public Health and Safety, of the Tribal-State Compact for Class III Gaming. - LSM</p> <p>Payments by the Tribe intended to compensate the City for costs of increased services are given in the MOA and the Tribal-State Compact for Class III Gaming. In addition, the Tribe shall have medical technicians on staff at the project site, provide emergency medical and fire training to all staff, and maintain standards no less stringent than City or County ordinances and Washington State Law addressing fire safety.</p> | <p>significant effects on AHFD. The increase in traffic through Fire District 10 – West Plains District as a result of Alternative 1 could significantly increase District’s call volume. The Tribe shall provide fair-share assistance to District 10 through the existing mechanism established within Section XIV, Public Health and Safety, of the Tribal-State Compact for Class III Gaming. - LSM</p> <p>Payments by the Tribe intended to compensate the City for costs of increased services are given in the MOA and the Tribal-State Compact for Class III Gaming. In addition, the Tribe shall have medical technicians on staff at the project site, provide emergency medical and fire training to all staff, and maintain standards no less stringent than City or County ordinances and Washington State Law addressing fire safety.</p> | <p>Alternative 3 would not result in significant effects on AHFD. The increase in traffic through Fire District 10 – West Plains District as a result of Alternative 1 could significantly increase District’s call volume. The Tribe shall provide fair-share assistance to District 10 through the existing mechanism established within Section XIV, Public Health and Safety, of the Tribal-State Compact for Class III Gaming. - LSM</p> <p>The Tribe shall enter into an agreement with the City of Airway Heights for fire protection services. In addition, the Tribe shall have medical technicians on staff at the project site, provide emergency medical and fire training to all staff, and maintain standards no less stringent than City or County ordinances and Washington State Law addressing fire safety.</p> | NA |
| Electricity and Natural Gas | <p>Inland Power and Light (Inland Power) and Avista Utilities have the capacity to provide the project site with electricity and natural gas services, respectively. Alternative 1 would not result in significant adverse effects on electricity or natural gas services. - NE</p> | <p>Inland Power and Avista Utilities have the capacity to provide the project site with electricity and natural gas services, respectively. Alternative 2 would not result in significant adverse effects on electricity or natural gas services. - NE</p> | <p>Inland Power and Avista Utilities have the capacity to provide the project site with electricity and natural gas services, respectively. Alternative 3 would not result in significant adverse effects on electricity or natural gas services. - NE</p> | NE |

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|---------------------------------|--|---|---|-----------|
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Noise | | | | |
| Construction Noise (Traffic) | Alternative 1 construction traffic would result in a 1 dBA Leq increase in the existing ambient noise level in the vicinity of area roadways, which is not an audible increase. - LS | Alternative 2 construction trips would result in less than a 1 dBA Leq increase in the existing ambient noise level, and thus would not result in a significant adverse effect to ambient noise levels during any phase of construction. - LS | Alternative 3 construction trips would result in less than a 1 dBA Leq increase in the existing ambient noise level, and thus would not result in a significant adverse effect to ambient noise levels during any phase of construction. - LS | NE |
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Construction Noise (Stationary) | The maximum stationary construction noise level for Alternative 1 at the nearest sensitive noise receptor would be greater than the Federal Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) of 67 dBA Leq. - LSM | The maximum stationary construction noise level for Alternative 2 at the nearest sensitive noise receptor would be greater than the NAC of 67 dBA Leq, a potentially significant effect. - LSM | The maximum stationary construction noise level for Alternative 3 at the nearest sensitive noise receptor would be greater than the NAC of 67 dBA Leq, a potentially significant effect. - LSM | NE |
| Mitigation | The Tribe shall implement noise abatement BMPs listed in Section 5.2.10 , to minimize noise generated during construction. | The Tribe shall implement noise abatement BMPs listed in Section 5.2.10 (Mitigation Measure A-D), to minimize noise generated during construction. | The Tribe shall implement noise abatement BMPs listed in Section 5.2.10 , to minimize noise generated during construction. | |
| Construction Vibration | The predicted vibration levels from construction of Alternative 1 are below the significance threshold for structures at 25 feet and for annoyance of people at 100 feet and would not result in significant adverse effects. - LS | The predicted vibration levels from construction of Alternative 2 are below the significance threshold for structures at 25 feet and for annoyance of people at 100 feet and would not result in significant adverse effects. - LS | The predicted vibration levels from construction of Alternative 3 are below the significance threshold for structures at 25 feet and for annoyance of people at 100 feet and would not result in significant adverse effects. - LS | NE |
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|-----------|
| Operation Noise (Traffic) | Alternative 1 would increase traffic noise, but would not result in significant adverse effects associated with traffic noise levels. - LS | Alternative 2 would increase traffic noise, but would not result in significant adverse effects associated with traffic noise levels. - LS | Alternative 3 would increase traffic noise, but would not result in significant adverse effects associated with traffic noise levels. - LS | NE |
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Operation Noise (Stationary) | Alternative 1 would increase noise levels from heating, cooling, and ventilation systems; idling trucks; and parking lots. However, this would not exceed Federal NAC at nearby sensitive receptors. - LS | Alternative 2 would increase noise levels from heating, cooling, and ventilation systems; idling trucks; and parking lots. However, this would not exceed Federal NAC at nearby sensitive receptors. - LS | Alternative 3 would increase noise levels from heating, cooling, and ventilation systems; idling trucks; and parking lots. However, this would not exceed Federal NAC at nearby sensitive receptors. - LS | NE |
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Operation Vibration | Commercial and hotel uses do not include sources of perceptible vibration. Therefore, operation of Alternative 1 would not result in significant adverse effects associated with vibration. - NE | Commercial uses do not include sources of perceptible vibration. Therefore, operation of Alternative 2 would not result in significant adverse effects associated with vibration. - NE | Commercial and hotel uses do not include sources of perceptible vibration. Therefore, operation of Alternative 3 would not result in significant adverse effects associated with vibration. - NE | NE |
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Compatibility with Aircraft Noise | The western half of the project site is located within a Military Influence Area (MIA) as defined by the Fairchild AFB, the boundaries of which were determined based on the primary areas of aircraft over flight and potential for exposure to noise and vibrations. Exposure of hotel patrons to noise from aircraft could create the potential for annoyance and nuisance | The project site would not include the development of a hotel tower, thus aircraft noise would not significantly add to or affect the potential noise effects resulting from Alternative 2. - NE | The western half of the project site is located within a MIA as defined by the Fairchild AFB, the boundaries of which were determined based on the primary areas of aircraft over flight and potential for exposure to noise and vibrations. Exposure of hotel patrons to noise from aircraft could create the potential for annoyance and nuisance complaints. - LSM | NE |

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|-----------------------|--|---|---|-----------|
| Mitigation | materials would be stored, handled, and disposed of during operation of Alternative 1; however adherence to state, federal, and manufacturer's guidelines would prevent impacts from use of these materials to the public or the environment. – LS NA | materials would be stored, handled, and disposed of during operation of Alternative 2; however adherence to state, federal, and manufacturer's guidelines would prevent impacts from use of these materials to the public or the environment. – LS NA | materials would be stored, handled, and disposed of during operation of Alternative 3; however adherence to state, federal, and manufacturer's guidelines would prevent impacts from use of these materials to the public or the environment. – LS NA | NA |
| Aesthetics | | | | |
| Construction | Aesthetic related impacts from construction of Alternative 1 would be temporary in nature and would not result in obstructed views of scenic resources. - LS | Aesthetic related impacts from construction of Alternative 2 would be temporary in nature and would not result in obstructed views of scenic resources. - LS | Aesthetic related impacts from construction of Alternative 3 would be temporary in nature and would not result in obstructed views of scenic resources. - LS | NE |
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Operation (Viewsheds) | Alternative 1 would conform with Spokane County standards for development adjacent to US-2, a designated aesthetic corridor. New development on the project site would significantly alter views. While the site-specific visual effects may be considered significant, the context of the project in relation to the larger landscape would be less than significant (additional development within a highly developed region). - LSM | Alternative 2 would conform with Spokane County standards for development adjacent to US-2, a designated aesthetic corridor. New development on the project site would significantly alter views. While the site-specific visual effects may be considered significant, the context of the project in relation to the larger landscape would be less than significant (additional development within a highly developed region).- LSM | Alternative 3 would conform with Spokane County standards for development adjacent to US-2, a designated aesthetic corridor. New development on the project site would significantly alter views. While the site-specific visual effects may be considered significant, the context of the project in relation to the larger landscape would be less than significant (additional development within a highly developed region).. - LSM | NE |
| Mitigation | Screening features and natural elements will be integrated into the landscaping design of the | Screening features and natural elements will be integrated into the landscaping design of the | Screening features and natural elements will be integrated into the landscaping design of the alternatives | NA |

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|--|---|---|---|-----------|
| | alternatives to screen the view of the facilities from existing residences directly adjacent to the project site. | alternatives to screen the view of the facilities from existing residences directly adjacent to the project site. | to screen the view of the facilities from existing residences directly adjacent to the project site. | |
| Operation (Shadow, Light, and Glare) | Alternative 1 could produce shadow, light, and glare in the project vicinity. - LSM | Alternative 2 could produce shadow, light, and glare in the project vicinity. - LSM | Alternative 3 could produce shadow, light, and glare in the project vicinity. - LSM | NE |
| Mitigation | The Tribe shall implement the BMPs listed in Section 5.2.12 , including the use of shielded and downcast lighting to prevent glare off-site and the use of non-reflective low-glare glass. | The Tribe shall implement the BMPs listed in Section 5.2.12 , including the use of shielded and downcast lighting to prevent glare off-site and the use of non-reflective low-glare glass. | The Tribe shall implement the BMPs listed in Section 5.2.12 , including the use of shielded and downcast lighting to prevent glare off-site and the use of non-reflective low-glare glass. | NA |
| Indirect Effects | | | | |
| From Off-site Traffic Mitigation | No significant indirect effects to any resource area are expected to occur as a result of off-site traffic mitigation under Alternative 1. - LSM | No significant indirect effects to any resource area are expected to occur as a result of off-site traffic mitigation under Alternative 2. - LSM | No significant indirect effects to any resource area are expected to occur as a result of off-site traffic mitigation under Alternative 3. - LSM | NE |
| Mitigation | See mitigation listed above. | See mitigation listed above. | See mitigation listed above. | NA |
| From Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements. | No significant indirect effects to any resource area are expected to occur as a result of water and wastewater infrastructure improvements under Alternative 1. - LSM | No significant indirect effects to any resource area are expected to occur as a result of water and wastewater infrastructure improvements under Alternative 2. - LSM | No significant indirect effects to any resource area are expected to occur as a result of water and wastewater infrastructure improvements under Alternative 3. - LSM | NE |
| Mitigation | See mitigation listed above. | See mitigation listed above. | See mitigation listed above. | NA |
| Growth-Inducing Effects | The minimal amount of commercial growth that may be induced by Alternative 1 is not expected to result in significant adverse environmental effects. - LS | The minimal amount of commercial growth that may be induced by Alternative 2 is not expected to result in significant adverse environmental effects. - LS | The minimal amount of commercial growth that may be induced by Alternative 3 is not expected to result in significant adverse environmental effects. - LS | NE |

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|---------------------------|--|---|---|-----------|
| Mitigation | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Cumulative Effects | | | | |
| Geology and Soils | All other developments that disturb one acre or more must comply with the requirements of the NPDES Construction General Permit, which requires BMPs be chosen and implemented to address water quality degradation by preventing erosion. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 1 would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects to geology or soils. - LSM | All other developments that disturb one acre or more must comply with the requirements of the NPDES Construction General Permit, which requires BMPs be chosen and implemented to address water quality degradation by preventing erosion. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 2 would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects to geology or soils. - LSM | All other developments that disturb one acre or more must comply with the requirements of the NPDES Construction General Permit, which requires BMPs be chosen and implemented to address water quality degradation by preventing erosion. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 3 would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects to geology or soils. - LSM | NE |
| Water Resources | Alternative 1 would not contribute to non-point source pollution and would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects to stormwater. The City is in the process of developing interim water supply sources and pursuing an Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) Project to address the overdraft conditions and provide for future supplies. Therefore, with the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 1 would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects on groundwater resources. - LSM | Alternative 2 would not contribute to non-point source pollution and would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects to stormwater. The City is in the process of developing interim water supply sources and pursuing an ASR Project to address the overdraft conditions and provide for future supplies. Therefore, with the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 2 would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects on groundwater resources. - LSM | Alternative 3 would not contribute to non-point source pollution and would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects to stormwater. The City is in the process of developing interim water supply sources and pursuing an ASR Project to address the overdraft conditions and provide for future supplies. Therefore, with the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 3 would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects on groundwater resources. - LSM | NE |
| Air Quality | Alternative 1 would not contribute to an adverse cumulative effect to air | Alternative 2 would not contribute to an adverse cumulative effect to air | Alternative 3 would not contribute to an adverse cumulative effect to air | NE |

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---------------------|
| | <p>quality.</p> <p>After the implementation of recommended mitigation for the Alternative 1, no intersection would have an LOS or an increase in delay in the cumulative year 2032 that would warrant a carbon monoxide Hot Spot Analysis.</p> <p>Development of Alternative 1 would result in an increase in greenhouse gas emissions well below the CEQ reporting standard of 25,000 MT of CO₂e per year, primarily due to indirect emissions from mobile sources. Mitigation measures in Section 5.2.3 would ensure compliance with applicable the Washington Climate Advisory Team GHG reduction strategies; therefore, Alternative 1 would not result in a significant adverse effect associated with cumulative GHG emissions and climate change. - LSM</p> | <p>quality.</p> <p>After the implementation of recommended mitigation for the Alternative 2, no intersection would have an LOS or an increase in delay in the cumulative year 2032 that would warrant a carbon monoxide Hot Spot Analysis.</p> <p>Development of Alternative 2 would result in an increase in greenhouse gas emissions well below the CEQ reporting standard of 25,000 MT of CO₂e per year, primarily due to indirect emissions from mobile sources. Mitigation measures in Section 5.2.3 would ensure compliance with applicable the Washington Climate Advisory Team GHG reduction strategies; therefore, Alternative 2 would not result in a significant adverse effect associated with cumulative GHG emissions and climate change. - LSM</p> | <p>quality.</p> <p>After the implementation of recommended mitigation for the Alternative 3, no intersection would have an LOS or an increase in delay in the cumulative year 2032 that would warrant a carbon monoxide Hot Spot Analysis.</p> <p>Development of Alternative 3 would result in an increase in greenhouse gas emissions slightly above the CEQ reporting standard of 25,000 MT of CO₂e per year, primarily due to indirect emissions from mobile sources. Mitigation measures in Section 5.2.3 would ensure compliance with applicable the Washington Climate Advisory Team GHG reduction strategies; therefore, Alternative 3 would not result in a significant adverse effect associated with cumulative GHG emissions and climate change. - LSM</p> | <p>NE</p> <p>NE</p> |
| Biological Resources | <p>With the implementation of mitigation measures discussed above, Alternative 1 would not result in cumulative effects to habitat, federally-listed species, migratory birds, or potential waters of the U.S. - LSM</p> | <p>With the implementation of mitigation measures discussed above, Alternative 2 would not result in cumulative effects to habitat, federally-listed species, migratory birds, or potential waters of the U.S. - LSM</p> | <p>With the implementation of mitigation measures discussed above, Alternative 3 would not result in cumulative effects to habitat, federally-listed species, migratory birds, or potential waters of the U.S. - LSM</p> | NE |
| Cultural Resources | <p>Cultural resources are afforded substantial protection through federal and state regulations and</p> | <p>Cultural resources are afforded substantial protection through federal and state regulations and</p> | <p>Cultural resources are afforded substantial protection through federal and state regulations and county</p> | NE |

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|-----------|
| | county historic preservation guidance. Because Alternative 1 would not impact cultural resources, it would not contribute towards potential adverse cumulative effects. - LSM | county historic preservation guidance. Because Alternative 2 would not impact cultural resources, it would not contribute towards potential adverse cumulative effects. - LSM | historic preservation guidance. Because Alternative 3 would not impact cultural resources, it would not contribute towards potential adverse cumulative effects. - LSM | |
| Socioeconomic Conditions | Planning documents for Spokane County and the City will continue to designate land uses and plan public services for anticipated growth in the region. Therefore, with the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 1 would not contribute to significant adverse cumulative socioeconomic effects. - LSM | Planning documents for Spokane County and the City will continue to designate land uses and plan public services for anticipated growth in the region. Therefore, with the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 2 would not contribute to significant adverse cumulative socioeconomic effects. - LSM | Planning documents for Spokane County and the City will continue to designate land uses and plan public services for anticipated growth in the region. Therefore, with the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 3 would not contribute to significant adverse cumulative socioeconomic effects. - LSM | NE |
| Transportation | <p>The increase in traffic generated by Alternative 1 would contribute to unacceptable traffic operations in the cumulative year 2032 at the study intersections below, causing them to operate below acceptable LOS standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hwy 2/Craig Road ▪ Hwy 2/Lundstrom Street ▪ Hwy 2/Lawson Street ▪ Hwy 2/Garfield Street ▪ Hwy 2/Hayford Road ▪ Craig Road/SR-902 ▪ Hwy 2/Fairchild AFB ▪ Craig Road/6th Avenue ▪ Hwy 2/Middle Driveway ▪ Hwy 2/North Driveway <p>- LSM</p> | <p>The increase in traffic generated by Alternative 2 would contribute to unacceptable traffic operations in the cumulative year 2032 at the study intersections below, causing them to operate below acceptable LOS standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hwy 2/Craig Road ▪ Hwy 2/Lundstrom Street ▪ Hwy 2/Garfield Street ▪ Hwy 2/Hayford Road ▪ Craig Road/SR-902 ▪ Hwy 2/Middle Driveway <p>- LSM</p> | <p>The increase in traffic generated by Alternative 3 would contribute to unacceptable traffic operations in the cumulative year 2032 at the study intersections below, causing them to operate below acceptable LOS standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hwy 2/Craig Road ▪ Hwy 2/Lundstrom Street ▪ Hwy 2/Garfield Street ▪ Hwy 2/Hayford Road ▪ Craig Road/SR-902 ▪ Hwy 2/Middle Driveway <p>- LSM</p> | NE |

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|-----------------|---|---|---|-----------|
| Mitigation | The Tribe shall implement and pay a fair share contribution to traffic improvements detailed in Section 5.2.7 (G) for intersections adversely affected by Alternative 1. | The Tribe shall implement and pay a fair share contribution to traffic improvements detailed in Section 5.2.7 (H) for intersections adversely affected by Alternative 2. | The Tribe shall implement and pay a fair share contribution to traffic improvements detailed in Section 5.2.7 (I) for intersections adversely affected by Alternative 3. | NA |
| Land Use | Development within the City and County will be consistent with applicable planning documents and policies, which prevent disorderly growth and incompatible land uses. Alternative 1 would not contribute to adverse cumulative land use effects. | Development within the City and County will be consistent with applicable planning documents and policies, which prevent disorderly growth and incompatible land uses. Alternative 2 would not contribute to adverse cumulative land use effects. | Development within the City and County will be consistent with applicable planning documents and policies, which prevent disorderly growth and incompatible land uses. Alternative 3 would not contribute to adverse cumulative land use effects. | NE |
| | Alternative 1 would not convert designated agricultural land to urban uses, and thus would not contribute to adverse cumulative effects to agricultural lands. - LS | Alternative 2 would not convert designated agricultural land to urban uses, and thus would not contribute to adverse cumulative effects to agricultural lands. - LS | Alternative 3 would not convert designated agricultural land to urban uses, and thus would not contribute to adverse cumulative effects to agricultural lands. - LS | NE |
| Public Services | Approved projects would be required to follow the local plans and policies regarding public services and would have to pay connection and monthly fees as appropriate. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 1 would not result in cumulative adverse effects associated with Public Services. - LSM | Approved projects would be required to follow the local plans and policies regarding public services and would have to pay connection and monthly fees as appropriate. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 2 would not result in cumulative adverse effects associated with Public Services. - LSM | Approved projects would be required to follow the local plans and policies regarding public services and would have to pay connection and monthly fees as appropriate. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 3 would not result in cumulative adverse effects associated with Public Services. - LSM | NE |
| Noise | In the cumulative year 2032, traffic volumes would increase, but would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects to sensitive receptors. - LSM | In the cumulative year 2032, traffic volumes would increase, but would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects to sensitive receptors. - LSM | In the cumulative year 2032, traffic volumes would increase, but would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects to sensitive receptors. - LSM | NE |

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

| Resource | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | No Action |
|---------------------|---|---|---|-----------|
| Hazardous Materials | Approved projects would be required to follow applicable federal and state regulations concerning hazardous materials management through the NPDES permitting process. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 1 would not result in cumulative adverse effects associated with hazardous materials. - LSM | Approved projects would be required to follow applicable federal and state regulations concerning hazardous materials management through the NPDES permitting process. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 2 would not result in cumulative adverse effects associated with hazardous materials. - LSM | Approved projects would be required to follow applicable federal and state regulations concerning hazardous materials management through the NPDES permitting process. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 3 would not result in cumulative adverse effects associated with hazardous materials. - LSM | NE |
| Aesthetics | Approved projects would be required to comply with local policies related to design, landscaping, sign, and lighting ordinances. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 1 would not result in cumulative adverse effects associated with visual resources. - LSM | Approved projects would be required to comply with local policies related to design, landscaping, sign, and lighting ordinances. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 2 would not result in cumulative adverse effects associated with visual resources. - LSM | Approved projects would be required to comply with local policies related to design, landscaping, sign, and lighting ordinances. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 3 would not result in cumulative adverse effects associated with visual resources. - LSM | NE |

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable