

# ***EXECUTIVE SUMMARY***

---

***REDDING RANCHERIA FEE-TO-TRUST AND CASINO PROJECT***

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

## REDDING RANCHERIA FEE-TO-TRUST AND CASINO PROJECT

### ES.1 INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), has been prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to assess the environmental impacts of the Redding Rancheria's (Tribe's) proposed Fee-to-Trust and Casino Project, located just outside the southern boundary of the City of Redding (City) within Shasta County (County), California, which would involve the transfer of approximately 232 acres from fee to federal trust status (Proposed Action). For the purpose of this EIS, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) serves as the Lead Agency for compliance with NEPA, with the Tribe, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), City, and County serving as Cooperating Agencies.

### ES.2 PURPOSE AND NEED

The federal Proposed Action is the acquisition of the 232-acre site in trust for the Tribe pursuant to the Secretary's authority under the Indian Reorganization Act, 25 USC 5108. The purpose of the Proposed Action is to facilitate tribal self-sufficiency, self-determination, and economic development, thus, satisfying both the Department's land acquisition policy as articulated in the Department's trust land regulations at 25 C.F.R. Part 151, and the principle goal of IGRA as articulated in 25 U.S.C. § 2701. The need for the Department to act on the Tribe's application is established by the Department's regulations at 25 C.F.R. §§ 151.10(h) and 151.12.

### ES.3 SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES

This document describes and analyzes six development alternatives and the No Action Alternative, which are described in detail in **Section 2.0** and are summarized below. Other off-site alternatives were considered and determined infeasible; these alternatives are described in **Section 2.10**.

The Executive Summary Table (**Appendix K**) summarizes potential effects to each environmental issue area from each alternative, mitigation measures to avoid or minimize impacts, and levels of significance for each environmental impact.

### ALTERNATIVE A – PROPOSED PROJECT

Alternative A, the Proposed Project, includes the following components:

- The transfer of the Strawberry Fields Site (seven parcels totaling approximately 232 acres, currently owned in fee by the Tribe) to trust status for gaming purposes (Proposed Action);
- Subsequent development of the Strawberry Fields Site with a variety of uses including, but not limited to, an approximately 69,541-square foot (sf) casino, 250-room hotel, conference and event centers, restaurants, retail facilities, parking, and other supporting facilities;
- Construction of access roadways within the Off-site Access Improvement Areas; and
- Closure of the existing Win-River Casino and renovation of the facility into tribal services and housing uses.

At build-out, the gaming component of the casino-resort would include approximately 1,200 electronic gaming devices and 36 table games as well as service bars and a player's club. The hotel would be an approximately 119-foot tall 9-story building with a gross footprint of approximately 171,287 sf and would include a fitness center, winter garden, and spa. Proposed dining facilities would have a gross footprint of approximately 30,565 sf, with 655 total seats split between diverse dining opportunities. The Proposed Project also includes the construction of a 130,000-sf regional retail facility, a 52,200-sf multi-purpose event center, a 10,080-sf convention center, a 19,800-sf outdoor amphitheater (with 1,500 seats), and 43,820 sf of administrative/back of house space.

Under Alternative A, there are two options proposed to supply water to the Strawberry Fields Site. Under Water Supply Option 1, water would be provided through a connection to the City's municipal water supply infrastructure. Under Water Supply Option 2, water would be provided through the installation of groundwater wells on the Strawberry Fields Site. Similarly, under Alternative A, there are two options proposed to supply wastewater service to the Strawberry Fields Site. Under Wastewater Option 1, wastewater treatment would be provided by the City via connection to the City's conveyance system and wastewater treatment plant (WWTP). Under Wastewater Option 2, wastewater would be treated at an on-site WWTP, located to the south of the casino and hotel.

### **ALTERNATIVE B – PROPOSED PROJECT WITH NO RETAIL ALTERNATIVE**

Alternative B includes all of the same development components as Alternative A, except that Alternative B would not include the construction of the 130,000-sf regional retail facility.

### **ALTERNATIVE C – REDUCED INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE**

Alternative C would involve the fee-to-trust transfer of the Strawberry Fields Site and the construction of a similar development as that described under Alternative A, but at a smaller scale. For example, Alternative C would include a 56,412-sf casino facility and dining facilities with a gross footprint of 29,390 sf.

## **ALTERNATIVE D – NON-GAMING ALTERNATIVE**

Alternative D consists of the transfer of the Strawberry Fields Site into federal trust status and the subsequent development of a slightly smaller hotel, surface parking area, and dining facilities than described under Alternative A. There would be no casino, multi-purpose events center, outdoor amphitheater, or convention space under Alternative D and the existing Win-River Casino would continue to operate.

## **ALTERNATIVE E – ANDERSON SITE ALTERNATIVE**

Alternative E would involve the fee-to-trust transfer of the Anderson Site, a 55-acre site located at 3300 Automall Drive, south of Alexander Avenue, in the City of Anderson, California, and the construction of a similar development as that described under Alternative A. Alternative E includes, but is not limited to, the construction of a 69,541-sf casino, 250-room (165,787 sf) hotel, dining facilities with a gross footprint of approximately 30,565 sf, and a 19,800-sf outdoor amphitheater.

## **ALTERNATIVE F – EXPANSION OF EXISTING CASINO ALTERNATIVE**

Alternative F consists of the expansion of the Tribe's existing 141,571-sf Win-River Casino within the current 14.8-acre Rancheria, which is currently held in trust for the Tribe. The gaming floor would be expanded into the existing 9,826-sf event center, resulting in a total gaming floor of 42,484 sf. A new 10,000-sf event center and a 7-story parking garage housing 1,710 parking spaces would be constructed within the existing parking lot.

## **ALTERNATIVE G – NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

Under the No Action Alternative, none of the development alternatives considered within this EIS would be implemented. The No Action Alternative assumes that no parcels within the Strawberry Fields Site or Anderson Site would be taken into trust, and the Tribe would continue to operate its existing Win-River Casino as it does presently.

## **ES.4 ISSUES AND CONCERNS**

The BIA published a Notice of Intent (NOI) in the *Federal Register* on November 29, 2016, describing the Proposed Action and announcing the BIA's intent to prepare an EIS. The results of the scoping period were made available in a Scoping Report published by the BIA in May 2017. Issues raised during scoping generally fell into the following categories.

- Alternatives and Purpose and Need
- Geology and Soils
- Water Resources
- Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases
- Biological Resources
- Cultural and Paleontological Resources
- Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice
- Transportation

- Land Use
- Public Services and Utilities
- Noise
- Hazardous Materials
- Aesthetics
- Indirect Effects / Growth Inducing
- Cumulative Effects
- Procedural and Non-EIS Issues

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

## **ES.5 SUMMARY MATRIX**

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