

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

***SEMINOLE TRIBE OF FLORIDA
TRUST ACQUISITION AND RESORT PROJECT
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT***

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SEMINOLE TRIBE OF FLORIDA FEE-TO-TRUST FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

ES.1 – INTRODUCTION

This Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has been prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to assess the environmental effects of transferring 45-acres of property owned by the Seminole Tribe of Florida (STOF) in the City of Coconut Creek (City), Florida from fee ownership to a federal trust (Proposed Action) and the subsequent development of a hotel/resort and other ancillary uses by STOF (Proposed Project). The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) has a discretionary federal action when taking land into federal trust status pursuant to 25 C.F.R. Part 151. Although the property is adjacent to the existing STOF Coconut Creek Casino and would support the casino operations, neither the Proposed Project nor any of the alternatives considered in detail would expand gaming activities.

For the purpose of this EIS, the BIA serves as the Lead Agency for compliance with NEPA, with STOF, the City, and Broward County serving as Cooperating Agencies.

ES.2 – PURPOSE AND NEED

Implementation of the Proposed Action would assist STOF meet the following objectives:

- Consolidate STOF land holdings surrounding the existing trust property into one contiguous trust property.
- Strengthen the socioeconomic status of STOF by providing an augmented revenue source that could be used to fund the tribal government; fund a variety of social, housing, governmental, administrative, educational, health and welfare services to improve the quality of life of tribal members; and provide capital for other economic development and investment opportunities.
- Increase the ability for STOF to make donations to charitable organizations and governmental operations, including local educational institutions.
- Provide business and job opportunities for Tribal members and non-Tribal members.
- Allow STOF to diversify its holdings over time, so that it is no longer dependent upon the Federal or State government or even upon gaming to survive and prosper.
- Operation of the hotel/resort and related facilities would require the purchase of goods and services, increasing opportunities for local businesses and stimulating the local economy.

ES.3 – SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

The Proposed Action analyzed in this EIS is the “land into trust” decision for 45- acres of STOF property, including approximately 1.63-acres previously transferred in fee to STOF from the City of Coconut Creek

(Tract I, formerly a portion of 40th Street). The Proposed Project consists of the foreseeable consequence of the federal action, namely the mixed-use development of a hotel/resort complex with entertainment and conference venues, and retail facilities. The alternatives addressed in this EIS, including the No-Action Alternative, are summarized below. The potential adverse environmental effects and applicable mitigation measures relevant to each alternative are presented in **Section 4.0** and **Section 5.0** and summarized in **Table ES-1**.

ALTERNATIVE A – PROPOSED PROJECT WITH COCONUT CREEK APPROVALS AND AGREEMENTS

Alternative A consists of the phased construction of a hotel/resort facility, spa, conference center, structured parking, and retail village to be constructed on the approximately 45-acre site located in the City. Under Alternative A, development would include a 1,000-room twenty-story hotel tower adjacent to a resort-type pool and spa area along the western boundary of the project site, a conference center, and a 2,500 seat showroom facility. Alternative A would additionally include the previously abandoned section of NW 40th Street upon which a seven-level 2,400 space parking garage has been developed. Alternative A would increase an expansion of this parking structure on Tract G.

Alternative A assumes various local approvals which are outside the authority of the BIA, including City zoning approvals, site plan approvals, permits, and other agreements (“approvals and agreements”). Should the approvals and agreements between STOF and the City not be in effect or are found invalid by a third party challenge, the resulting project proposal has been described as Sub-Alternative A-1. As described in Section 2.1, under the legal rulings currently in effect, it is unlikely that Sub-Alternative A-1 would be selected as the Preferred Alternative in the Record of Decision.

ALTERNATIVE B – REDUCED INTENSITY PROJECT

Reduced intensity development on the fee-to-trust property under Alternative B would include a ten-story 500-room hotel tower, a 2,250-space six-story parking structure on the southwest corner of the project site, a 2,500 seat showroom, and a retail village. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would not rely on City approvals and agreements for water, wastewater, fire, and law enforcement services. Rather, public utilities and services would be provided on-site or through service agreements with outside municipal utility providers for water and wastewater services.

ALTERNATIVE C – NO ACTION BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Under Alternative C, the No Action Alternative, no land would be placed into federal trust. Land use jurisdiction of the project site would remain with the City. Under the No Action by Federal Government alternative, two potential scenarios could occur on STOF owned fee parcels. Under the first scenario, STOF would develop the fee parcels consistent with the Seminole Planned MainStreet Development District (Seminole PMDD) plans with approval and agreements by the City. Scenario two assumes no further development would occur on STOF owned fee parcels and the existing facilities and land uses currently on-site remain the same.

ES.4 – AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The BIA published a Notice of Intent (NOI) comment period that began on August 6, 2010 and closed on September 20, 2010. The results of the scoping period were made available in a Scoping Report published by the BIA June 2011. Issues raised during scoping generally fell into the following general categories.

- Alternatives and Purpose and Need
- Applicable regulations, e.g. Subject to 25 C.F.R. § 151 of Section 20 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA)
- Land Resources
- Water Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural and Paleontological Resources
- Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice
- Resources Use Patterns
- Public Services
- Visual Resources
- Noise
- Indirect Effects
- Cumulative Effects

The BIA issued the Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft EIS on August 31, 2012. The 45-day comment period extended from the date of publication in the Federal Register until October 15, 2012. The BIA also conducted a public hearing on the Draft EIS at the City of Coconut Creek Commission Chambers on the evening of October 9, 2012 to solicit public and agency comments to the Draft EIS. Issues raised during the Draft EIS comment period fell into the following general categories.

- Alternatives and Purpose and Need
- Applicable regulations, e.g. Subject to 25 C.F.R. § 151 of Section 20 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA)
- Land Resources
- Water Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Socioeconomics Effects
- Public Services, particularly Traffic
- Visual Resources
- Noise
- Indirect Effects

To the extent required by NEPA, this Final EIS has incorporated the issues and concerns identified during the scoping process and from comments on the Draft EIS.

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, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
Geology and Soils					
<i>Topography and Mineral Resources</i>	<i>Site previously cleared, graded, and paved; therefore, the topographic features of the site would be preserved. No known or mapped mineral resources are located within the project site, development and use of the land would not affect such resources. -LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	NE
<i>Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	LS	LS	LS	NE
<i>Soils/Geology</i>	<i>Development of Alternative A would require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). With incorporation of the Best Management Practices (BMPs) within the site SWPPP, effects from implementation of Alternative A on soils and geology would be minimal and, therefore, less than significant. -LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -LS</i>	NE
<i>Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A.
<i>After Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
Seismicity	Given that no known fault traces cross the area, the potential for surface rupturing along an on-site fault trace is low and is not a constraint for Alternative A. –LS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS	NE
Mitigation	I. STOF shall obtain all necessary permit approvals from the Cocomar Water Control District (CWCD), the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) and Broward County, prior to constructing the link to the Northwest Cocomar Basin and creating the new off-site retention pond. These permits would include an Environmental Resource Permit from the SFWMD. J. STOF will work with the CWCD and SFWMD to maintain an interconnection between the Northwest drainage sub-basin and the C-14 drainage sub-basin.	N/A	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	N/A	N/A
After Mitigation	LS	LS	LS	LS	NE
Water Resources					
Stormwater and Flooding	With the development of the proposed on-site and off-site retention ponds, Alternative A would not result in any adverse effects in regards to stormwater and flooding –LS	With the development of the proposed on-site retention ponds and the underground stormwater attenuation facilities, Sub-Alternative A-1 would not result in any adverse effects in regards to	Impacts would be the same as for Sub-Alternative A-1 –LS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS	NE

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
After Mitigation	NE	NE	NE	NE	N/A
Construction Effects	Potential discharge into surface waters of 1) sediment from erosion caused by construction-related ground disturbance; 2) construction-related materials such as concrete washings, oil, and grease; and 3) pollutants from the use of diesel-powered equipment and temporary storage of fuel and oil on site. –PS	stormwater and flooding – LS Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS	N/A
Mitigation	A. As described under Section 5.2.1 , an NPDES General Construction permit from the USEPA shall be complied with and a SWPPP shall be prepared. The SWPPP shall describe construction practices, stabilization techniques and structural BMPs that are to be implemented to prevent erosion and minimize sediment transport as outlined in Section 5.2.2 . B. In accordance the NPDES General Construction permit, a sampling and monitoring program shall be developed and implemented to assess the	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	N/A.

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
	<p><i>quality of surface water entering and leaving the project site. At a minimum, sampling sites shall include a location above all proposed development and a location downstream of all development. Analyses shall include total suspended solids (TSS), oils and greases.</i></p> <p><i>C. As described in detail under Section 5.2.4, Biological Resources, Mitigation Measure B, if warranted, a 404 permit shall be obtained from the USACE prior to any discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S, and a 401 Water Quality Certification shall be obtained from the USEPA.</i></p>				
After Mitigation	LS	LS	LS	LS	N/A
Wastewater	<p><i>Wastewater generated from the Proposed Project would be treated in the City of Coconut Creek treatment system per the Mitigation Agreement. – LS</i></p>	<p><i>Wastewater would be treated at an on-site wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) and potentially recycled for irrigation, toilet flushing, fire suppression, and use in the cooling system. –PS</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be similar but less than Sub-Alternative A-1. –PS</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be the same as Alternative A –LS</i></p>	N/A
Mitigation	N/A	<p><i>K. Prior to operation, STOF shall drill an injection test well to determine design parameters for treated effluent disposal. A</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation would be the same as for Sub-Alternative A-1.</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i></p>	N/A

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
After Mitigation	LS	<p><i>permit shall be obtained from the USEPA prior to injection.</i></p> <p>LS</p>	LS	LS	N/A
Groundwater	<p><i>Development would not require the use of on-site groundwater supplies. –NE</i></p> <p><i>Stormwater control facilities would provide filtering of runoff to improve water quality. The use of natural detention ponds would allow collected stormwater to percolate into the groundwater table. There would be no adverse impacts to groundwater resources from stormwater. –LS</i></p>	<p><i>Groundwater would be used for domestic and landscaping purposes –PS</i></p> <p><i>Stormwater control facilities would be similar to Alternative A. – LS</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be similar but less than Sub-Alternative A-1. –PS</i></p> <p><i>Stormwater control facilities would be similar to Alternative A. –LS</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be the same as Alternative A.</i></p>	NE
Mitigation	N/A	<p><i>K. A test well shall be drilled to a minimum depth of approximately 100 feet, and screen sections shall be placed in the water bearing zone of the Biscayne Aquifer.</i></p> <p><i>M. Prior to construction of either the water extraction well or the treated effluent injection well, STOF will pass a Tribal Resolution committing to compliance with the terms and conditions of the Tribal Criteria Manual to the Seminole Water Rights Compact regarding wetlands, domestic water</i></p>	<p><i>Mitigation would be the same as for Sub-Alternative A-1</i></p>	N/A	N/A

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
		<i>wells, and underground injection wells.</i>			
<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	LS/PS	LS/PS	LS	N/A
Air Quality					
<i>Construction and Demolition Emissions</i>	<i>Emissions from construction activities are expected to result in minimal effects on air quality. Construction would not cause an exceedance of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	NE
<i>Mitigation</i>	<p>A. STOF shall control fugitive dust emissions (PM10) during construction through the following actions, as applicable:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Spray exposed soil with water or other suppressant. 2. Minimize dust emissions during transport of fill material or soil by wetting down loads, ensuring adequate freeboard (space from the top of the material to the top of the truck bed) on trucks, and/or covering loads. 3. Promptly clean up spills of transported material on public roads. 	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	N/A.

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
	<p>4. <i>Restrict traffic on site to reduce soil disturbance and the transport of material onto roadways.</i></p> <p>5. <i>Locate construction equipment and truck staging areas away from sensitive receptors as practical and in consideration of potential effects on other resources.</i></p> <p>B. <i>STOF shall control emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOC), nitrogen oxides (NOx), sulfur oxides (SOx), and carbon monoxide (CO) whenever reasonable and practicable by requiring all diesel-powered equipment be properly maintained and minimizing idling time to 5 minutes when construction equipment is not in use, unless per engine manufacturer's specifications or for safety reasons more time is required. Since these emissions would be generated primarily by construction equipment, machinery engines shall be kept in good mechanical condition to minimize exhaust emissions.</i></p>				

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	LS	LS	LS	N/A
Operational Emissions	<i>Operation of Alternative A would not result in significant adverse effects associated with the regional air quality environment. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	NE
<i>Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>After Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Conformity Determination	<i>The project area is either unclassifiable or in attainment for all national standards and, therefore, would not be subject to a conformity determination. –NE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as Alternative A. –NE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as Alternative A. –NE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as Alternative A. –NE</i>	NE
<i>Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>After Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Biological Resources					
Habitat	<i>Construction of the hotel/resort on the project site would not significantly affect local populations of wildlife due to the presence of development and the reduced quality of existing habitat types on the site. –NE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –NE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –NE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –NE</i>	NE
<i>Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
<i>After Mitigation</i>	<i>NE</i>	<i>NE</i>	<i>NE</i>	<i>NE</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>Federally Listed Animal Species</i>	<i>The site and/or surrounding vicinity represent potential habitat for one Federally listed animal species: Wood stork. – PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	<i>NE</i>
<i>Mitigation</i>	<p><i>A. A pre-construction survey will be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to the start of construction to ensure that no wood storks are present within the project site.</i></p> <p><i>B. Worker awareness training for wood stork will be conducted by a qualified biologist for all construction crew members. The training will include the following: a description and an identification of the wood stork and its habitat needs; an explanation of the status of the species and its protection under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA); and a list of measures being taken to reduce impacts to the species during project construction. A fact sheet conveying this information will be prepared for distribution to the crew members and anyone else who may enter the project site.</i></p> <p><i>C. While it is not anticipated that the wood stork will be</i></p>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>N/A</i>

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
	<p><i>present, if at any time a wood stork is observed within the project site, then all work will be stopped until informal consultation with USFWS is initiated.</i></p> <p><i>A qualified biologist will be present periodically to monitor construction activities conducted in the vicinity of and within the onsite retention ponds to jointly ensure that no wood storks OR migratory birds and waterfowl protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (16 USC Sections 703-712) are present or harmed. It is recommended that a biological monitor be present onsite to monitor construction activities such as the initiation of groundbreaking and periodically thereafter when new intensive construction activities are planned (e.g., pile driving or other high-volume or high-vibration activities) near or within the retention ponds.</i></p>				
After Mitigation	LS	LS	LS	LS	NE
Migratory Birds	<i>No migratory birds are known to utilize the site. However lighting systems proposed within the development which could potentially attract birds</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	NE

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1	
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>that could be injured or killed upon impact –PS</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	N/A
	<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	LS	LS	LS	NE
	<i>Waters of U.S.</i>	<i>There are no waters of the U.S. onsite. Potential affects to off-site waters of the U.S may occur during construction and operation of Alternative A –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be similar to Alternative A, plus potential impacts to a nearby off-site wetland. –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Sub-Alternative A -1. –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	N/A
	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Implementation of the minimization and avoidance measures identified for Water Resources, above, would mitigate for potential adverse effects to off-site waters of the U.S. from stormwater runoff during the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Project</i>	<i>Mitigation would be similar to Alternative A, plus the test well detailed in Water Resources Mitigation Measure K and adoption of the Seminole Water Rights Compact Tribal Criteria Manual included as Water Resources Mitigation Measure M above.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Sub-Alternative A-1.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	N/A
	<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	LS	LS	LS	NE
		<i>No known historic properties or paleontological resources have been identified in the immediate vicinity of the project site. There is a slight possibility that previously</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	NE

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
Mitigation	<p><i>unknown cultural resources will be encountered during ground disturbing activities. – PS</i></p> <p><i>A. In the event of any inadvertent discovery of prehistoric or historic archaeological resources or paleontological resources during construction-related earth-moving activities, shall be subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act as amended (36 CFR 800), the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC 3001 et seq.), and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (16 U.S.C. 470a-mm). Specifically, procedures for post review discoveries without prior planning pursuant to 36 CFR 800.13 shall be followed.</i></p> <p><i>All work within 50 feet of the find shall be halted until a professional archaeologist can assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant by the archaeologist, then representatives of STOF and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) shall meet with the archaeologist to determine the appropriate course of action, including the development of a Treatment Plan, if</i></p>	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	N/A

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
	<p><i>necessary. All significant cultural materials recovered shall be subject to scientific analysis, professional curation, and a report prepared by the professional archaeologist according to current professional standards.</i></p> <p><i>B. If human remains are discovered during ground-disturbing activities on Tribal lands, work shall halt in the vicinity, the Broward County Coroner should be notified immediately, and, pursuant to the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), Section 10.4 Inadvertent Discoveries, a Tribal Official and BIA representative will be contacted immediately. No further ground disturbances shall occur until the Tribal Official and BIA representative have examined the findings and agreed on the appropriate course of action. If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the BIA representative shall notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The MLD is responsible for recommending the appropriate disposition of the remains and any grave goods.</i></p>				

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
	<i>C. In the event of accidental discovery of paleontological materials during ground-disturbing activities, a qualified paleontologist shall be contacted to evaluate the significance of the find and collect the materials for curation as appropriate.</i>				
<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	LS	LS	LS	NE
Socioeconomics					
<i>Economic Effects</i>	<i>Potential effects due to the loss of state and federal tax revenues resulting from the operation as a sovereign nation on trust land would be offset by increased local, state and federal tax revenues resulting from construction and operation of Alternative A, and from revenue sharing programs per the tribal state compact and local agreements –BE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –BE</i>	<i>Construction and operation of the Alternative B would generate substantial economic output for a variety of businesses in Broward County. Additionally, Alternative B would generate substantial indirect tax revenues for state, County, and local governments. –BE</i>	<i>Beneficial economic impacts would be similar to Alternative A. –BE</i>	NE
<i>Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>After Mitigation</i>	BE	BE	BE	BE	NE
<i>Employment</i>	<i>Broward County is anticipated to be able to easily accommodate the increased demand for labor during the operation of Alternative A. Alternative A would result in employment and wages for persons previously</i>	<i>Impacts would be the similar to Alternative A. –BE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the similar to Alternative A. –BE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the similar to Alternative A. –BE</i>	NE

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
	<i>unemployed and would contribute to the alleviation of poverty among lower income households. –BE</i>				
Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
After Mitigation	BE	BE	BE	BE	NE
Housing	<i>There is anticipated to be an adequate supply of vacant homes to support potential impacts to the regional labor market under Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be similar to Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be similar to Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be similar to Alternative A. –LS</i>	NE
Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
After Mitigation	LS	LS	LS	LS	NE
Social Effects					
Crime	<i>Increased tax revenues resulting from Alternative A and local agreements between the Tribe and the City of Coconut Creek would fund expansion of law enforcement services required to accommodate increased service demands.</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be similar to Alternative A. –LS</i>	NE
Schools	<i>Due to the limited number of employees expected to relocate to the project area as a result of Alternative A, effects to local schools would be negligible. Further, increased tax revenues</i>				

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
Libraries and Parks	<i>resulting from Alternative A and local agreements between the Tribe and the City of Coconut Creek would further reduce effects. –LS</i>				
	<i>Due to the limited number of employees expected to relocate to the project area, it is expected that effects to libraries and parks would be negligible. –LS</i>				
	Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
After Mitigation	LS	LS	LS	LS	NE
Seminole Tribe of Florida	<i>Alternative A would benefit the Tribe in at least two ways: (1) it would generate new income to fund operation of the Tribal Government and (2) Tribal members would have access to new jobs created on the project site. –BE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –BE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –BE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –BE</i>	NE
	Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	After Mitigation	BE	BE	BE	BE
Environmental Justice	<i>No low-income or minority communities, except for the Tribe itself, were identified in the vicinity of the project site. There are no adverse effects to Environmental Justice communities under this alternative. –NE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –NE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –NE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –NE</i>	NE

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
After Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	NE
Transportation					
Construction Impacts	The introduction of material delivery trucks on Sample Road and 54 th Street and/or access roadway would disrupt traffic flow and require the appropriate signage and flagging to ensure safe operations. –PS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS	NE
Mitigation	<p>A. A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) shall be implemented to address lane closure during construction, areas where night construction is proposed, and other issues identified in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways (US DOT FHWA, 2003). The TMP shall be submitted to the City for review prior to start of construction.</p> <p>B. Prior to the finalization of construction plans, the Tribe shall work with emergency service providers to avoid impending emergency response service. Police, fire, ambulance, and other emergency response providers shall</p>	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	N/A

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
	<i>be notified in advance of the construction schedule, the exact location of construction activities, duration of construction period, and any access restrictions that could impact emergency response services. The TMP shall include details regarding emergency service coordination. Copies of the TMP shall be provided to all affected emergency service providers as well as local school districts with buses traveling along SR-7 and Sample Road.</i>				
After Mitigation	LS	LS	LS	LS	NE
Operational Impacts	<i>The operation of Alternative A would result in an increase in vehicle traffic on the surrounding roadways. - PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be similar to but less than Alternative A. -PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. -PS</i>	NE
Mitigation	<p><i>C. At Sample Road and 54th Street, reconfigure to convert one through lane into a second left turn lane (eastbound).</i></p> <p><i>D. Construct a two-lane roundabout or signalization at NW 54th Avenue and Cullum Road.</i></p> <p><i>E. Construct main site access improvement at NW 54th Avenue and</i></p>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A and the traffic mitigation measures included in the PMDD.</i>	<p><i>O. Close existing site access at 40th Street and signalization of NW 54th Avenue and 40th Street.</i></p> <p><i>P. Signalize West Access Road, specially the SR-7/US-441 approach and NW 40th Street Connector.</i></p>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	N/A

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
Land Use	<p><i>North Access, including signalization, dual left turn lanes, a right turn lane on southbound approach, a left turn lane, shared left-right lane, and a right turn lane on the North Access road eastbound approach.</i></p> <p><i>F. Close existing site access at 40th Street and NW 54th Avenue.</i></p> <p><i>G. Alignment improvements at NW 40th Street and SR-7/US-441 site access point.</i></p> <p><i>H. Signalization of West Access, specifically northbound SR-7 approach and NW 40th Street Corridor.</i></p>				
	<p><i>After Mitigation</i></p> <p align="center">LS</p>	LS	LS	LS	NE
<i>Land Use</i>	<p><i>Alternative A is consistent with adopted and proposed City of Coconut Creek land use plans for the project site. Additionally, Alternative A would be developed in a manner consistent with specific development standards outlined in the PMDD. –LS</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be similar to Alternative A. Development would be generally consistent with the City of Coconut Creek land use plans for the project site. – LS</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be the same as for Sub-Alternative A-1. –LS</i></p>	<p><i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i></p>	NE

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
After Mitigation	LS	LS	LS	LS	NE
Public Services and Utilities					
Water Supply	In compliance with the Mitigation Agreement, City of Coconut Creek Water and Wastewater Utility (CCWWU) would supply water to the project site. –LS	Due to the development and operation of an on-site water supply system, no effects to off-site public water supply distribution facilities would occur as a result of Sub-Alternative A-1. However, in the event of a groundwater shortage or water quality issue that would prevent STOF from obtaining sufficient groundwater via an on-site water supply system, potentially significant impacts could occur including the inability to meet Sub-Alternative A-1 water consumption needs. –PS	Impacts would be the same as Sub-Alternative A-1. –LS	Potential impacts to the CCWWU, including water supply capacity and infrastructure availability would be less than significant with the incorporation of specific cost reimbursement measures to the City as part of the PMDD approval conditions. –LS	NE
Mitigation	<p>A. STOF shall work with the City of Coconut Creek to extend reclaimed water infrastructure to the project site.</p> <p>B. The use of recycled water shall be maximized to the extent feasible. Potential uses include toilet flushing, landscape irrigation, emergency fire flow, and evaporative cooling.</p>	<p>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A with the addition of the mitigation described below.</p> <p>C. If on-site production wells are not feasible, STOF shall seek to obtain a services agreement with the City of Margate or the City of Corral Springs to provide water supply service. The construction of an underground</p>	Mitigation would be the same as for Sub-Alternative A-1.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A, as appropriate.	N/A

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
		<i>connection to existing infrastructure would occur in the vicinity of the project site. STOF would fund any required infrastructure improvements required.</i>			
<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	LS	LS	LS	NE
<i>Wastewater</i>	<i>STOF would connect to existing City of Coconut Creek wastewater system. –LS</i>	<i>STOF would provide on-site sewage conveyance, treatment, and disposal through development of a new, independent sewage treatment plant, which would meet or exceed Federal and standards. –NE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Sub-Alternative A-1. –NE</i>	<i>Potential impacts to the CCWWU and Broward County facilities, including wastewater treatment capacity and conveyance availability would be less than significant with the incorporation of specific cost reimbursement measures to the City as part of the PMDD approval conditions. –LS</i>	NE
<i>Mitigation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	NE	NE	LS	NE
<i>Solid Waste Service</i>	<i>The construction and operation of Alternative A would result in an increase in solid waste requiring disposal. This is not a significant impact to either the daily or annual intake capacity of the landfill. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	NE
<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>D. Construction waste shall be recycled to the fullest extent practicable by diverting green waste and recyclable building</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	N/A

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
	<p><i>materials from the solid waste stream.</i></p> <p><i>E. Environmentally preferable materials shall be selected, to the extent practical, for construction of facilities.</i></p> <p><i>F. A solid waste management plan shall be adopted by STOF that addresses recycling and solid waste reduction on site. These measures shall include, but not be limited to, the installation of a trash compactor for cardboard and paper products, and annual waste stream analysis.</i></p> <p><i>G. Recycling bins shall be installed throughout the facilities for glass, cans and paper products.</i></p> <p><i>H. Decorative trash and recycling receptacles shall be placed strategically throughout the site to encourage people not to litter.</i></p> <p><i>I. Security guards shall be trained to discourage littering on site.</i></p>				
<i>After Mitigation</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>NE</i>

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1	
Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications	<i>Construction</i>	<i>Construction on-site could damage underground utilities, leading to outages and/or serious injury. –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	NE
	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>J. At least three working days prior to construction, STOF shall contact the Utility Notification Center, which provides a free “Dig Alert” to all excavators (e.g., contractors, homeowners, and others) in Florida. This call shall automatically notify all utility service providers at the excavator’s work site. In response, the utility service providers shall mark or stake the horizontal path of underground facilities, provide information about the facilities, and/or give clearance to dig.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	N/A
	<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	LS	LS	LS	NE
	<i>Operation</i>	<i>Current FPL infrastructure has enough capacity to accommodate the estimated increase in usage under Alternative A, effects to electricity are less-than-significant. There is the potential for excessive</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. – LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. – LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. – LS</i>	NE

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
Mitigation	<p><i>electrical usage and inefficiencies at the resort due to air leaks, heating and cooling waste, and inefficient lighting, appliances, and electrical equipment. –LS</i></p> <p><i>K. STOF shall enter into discussions with Florida Power and Light to provide expanded electrical service to the project site.</i></p> <p><i>L. Buildings shall be thoroughly insulated and weatherized so as to minimize energy loss due to heating and cooling waste. Doors and windows shall be regularly inspected for air leaks, and shall be caulked or weather-stripped as appropriate where leaks are identified. Storm windows and double-paned glass shall be used to the extent practicable, shall be maintained in good repair, and shall be weatherized. New windows shall meet energy-saving criteria set forth by the National Fenestration Rating Council (NFRC). Caulk and seal shall be used as appropriate to prevent air leaks where plumbing, ducting, or electrical wiring penetrates through</i></p>	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	N/A.

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
	<p><i>exterior walls, floors, ceilings, and soffits over cabinets. Rubber gaskets shall be installed as appropriate behind outlet and switch plates on exterior walls. Exterior walls shall be sealed with appropriate sealants.</i></p> <p><i>M. The selected heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system shall minimize the use of energy by means of using high efficiency variable speed chillers, high efficiency low emission steam and/or hot water boilers, variable speed hot water and chilled water pumps, variable air volume air handling units, and air-to-air heat recovery where appropriate. Hotel rooms shall have four pipe fan coil units and individual exhaust vents. Pool area dehumidification shall include heat recovery systems. All systems shall be designed in accordance with American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) Standard 90. Complex ventilation shall be designed in accordance with ASHRAE Standard 62. A building automation system shall</i></p>				

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
	<p><i>be integrated with all building support systems.</i></p> <p><i>N. Energy efficient lighting shall be installed throughout the facilities. Dual-level light switching shall be installed in support areas to allow users of the buildings to reduce lighting energy usage when the task being performed does not require all lighting to be on. Day lighting controls shall be installed near windows to reduce the artificial lighting level when natural lighting is available. Controls shall be installed for exterior lighting so it is turned off during the day.</i></p> <p><i>O. Water systems shall be inspected regularly for leaks or degradation that could lead to leaks, and water heater tanks and pipes shall be insulated or lagged to the extent practicable.</i></p> <p><i>P. Non-aerating, low-flow faucets and showerheads shall be installed in the hotel rooms.</i></p> <p><i>Q. New, energy-efficient water heaters shall be installed, and shall be evaluated for</i></p>				

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
	replacement every seven years.				
	R. Water tanks shall be maintained and cleaned every three months to remove sediment in order to maintain the heat transfer efficiency of water heaters.				
After Mitigation	LS	LS	LS	LS	NE
Law Enforcement	Development of this alternative may increase demands on law enforcement through increased activity at the site. To address this potential the Tribe has committed to a mutual services agreement with the City of Coconut Creek. –LS	STOF would provide on-site law enforcement services. –PS	Impacts would be the same as for Sub-Alternative A-1. –PS	Given that the Alternative C would increase patronage to the project site, law enforcement needs would increase; however, the STOF would provide the funding necessary for increased service through state and local property taxes. –LS	NE
Mitigation	S. Seminole Tribal Police Officers shall provide traffic control with appropriate signage and the presence of peak-hour traffic control staff. This shall aid in the prevention of off-site parking, which could create possible security issues. T. STOF shall provide on-site Seminole Tribal Police Officers to reduce and prevent criminal and civil incidents and shall coordinate response calls with the Coconut	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A with the addition of the mitigation described below.	Mitigation would be the same as for Sub-Alternative A-1.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	N/A.

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
	Creek Police Department.				
	U. STOF shall adopt a Responsible Alcoholic Beverage Policy that shall include, but not be limited to, checking identification of patrons and refusing service to those who have had enough to drink.				
After Mitigation	LS	LS	LS	LS	NE
Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Service					NE
Construction	Similar to risks found at other construction sites, construction of Alternative A may introduce potential sources of fire to the project site. –PS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS	NE
Mitigation	V. During construction, any construction equipment that normally includes a spark arrester shall be equipped with an arrester in good working order. This includes, but is not limited to, vehicles, heavy equipment, and chainsaws. Staging areas, welding areas, or areas slated for development using spark-producing equipment shall be cleared of dried vegetation or other materials that could	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.	N/A.

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
	serve as fire fuel. To the extent feasible, the contractor shall keep these areas clear of combustible materials in order to maintain a firebreak.				
After Mitigation	LS	LS	LS	LS	NE
Operation	Based on the obligations assumed by STOF under the Mitigation Agreement, as well as the capacity of existing fire and emergency medical services, the impacts on fire and emergency services would be less than significant. –LS	STOF would provide on-site fire protection and emergency services. –PS	Impacts would be the same as for Sub-Alternative A-1. –PS	Given that the PMDD would increase patronage to the project site, fire protection needs would increase; however, the STOF would provide the funding necessary for increased service through state and local property taxes. –LS	NE
Mitigation	W. STOF shall use fire-resistant construction materials for the larger buildings and equip enclosed buildings with automatic sprinkler systems as required by applicable building codes, including the Florida Building Code. The automatic sprinkler systems shall be designed to meet or exceed the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards governing the different occupancies associated with the project structures. All fire protection water systems shall be in place before the introduction of	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A, with the addition of the following: AA. STOF shall adopt a Tribal ordinance which requires that on-reservation construction be in accordance with the fire safety standards that are equivalent to those in the Florida Building Code. The following components will be required by the Tribal ordinance: fire alarms, fire communication systems, fire suppression equipment, smoke evacuation and control	Mitigation would be the same as for Sub-Alternative A-1.	Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A, with the addition of the following:	N/A

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
<p align="center"><i>After Mitigation</i></p> <p>Noise</p>	<p><i>combustible material to any of the facilities.</i></p> <p>X. <i>Through the use of modern construction and fire engineering techniques, STOF shall build in automatic systems designed to contain any fire to the room of origin. All automatic systems will meet or exceed the NFPA standards.</i></p> <p>Y. <i>Through the use of modern fire engineering technology, STOF shall create and maintain a facility equipped with the latest early detection systems that insure an initial response to any fire alarm (automatic, local, or report). This would rely on automatic sprinkler systems in the occupied areas and smoke detection, along with automatic sprinkler systems, in the areas of the facility that are normally unoccupied, such as storerooms and mechanical areas. All early detection systems will meet or exceed the NFPA standards.</i></p>	<p><i>systems, fire-resistant construction, fire hydrant systems, sprinkler systems, and fire-control measures</i></p> <p>BB. <i>STOF Fire Department shall conduct annual staffing analyses, to ensure that its staff is properly trained and certified to provide fire protection and first response emergency services to the trust property. An annual apparatus analysis is also performed to determine the sufficiency of existing equipment for fire protection and first response emergency services on-site.</i></p> <p>CC. <i>STOF would comply with all fire protection and public safety provisions and design standards included within the 2008 Public Safety Plan.</i></p>			
	LS	LS	LS	LS	NE

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
<i>Construction Noise</i>	<i>Construction activities would not exceed the FHWA noise threshold of level of 78 dBA. – LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>NE</i>
<i>Mitigation</i>	<p><i>Construction using heavy equipment shall not be conducted between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Additional measures to reduce noise from construction equipment shall be maximized.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. All engine-powered equipment shall be equipped with adequate mufflers. Haul trucks shall be operated in accordance with posted speed limits. Truck engine exhaust brake (a.k.a. “Jake Brake”) use shall be limited to emergencies.</i> <i>2. Loud stationary construction equipment shall be located as far away from residential receptor areas as feasible.</i> <i>3. All diesel engine generator sets shall be provided with enclosures.</i> <i>4. All nighttime truck traffic activities, deliveries, and loading and unloading of equipment during the night shall be eliminated.</i> 	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>After Mitigation</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>NE</i>

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
<i>Operational Noise</i>	<i>On-site operational noise levels would comply with all local limits. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>NE</i>
<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>After Mitigation</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>NE</i>
Hazardous Materials	<i>There are no reported incidents of hazardous materials contamination on the site. There is the potential, however, for hazardous materials spills or inadvertent discoveries of hazardous materials to occur during construction. - PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be similar to Alternative A; operation of the wastewater treatment plant could create a potentially significant impact to the environment and the public. –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Sub-Alternative A-1. –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	<i>NE</i>
<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>The majority of waste produced during operation of the facilities would be non-hazardous. However, operation of emergency backup generators could have a potentially significant impact to the environment and public. –PS</i> <i>A. In the event that contaminated soil and/or groundwater or other hazardous materials are encountered during construction-related earth-moving activities, all work shall be halted until a qualified individual can assess the extent of contamination. If contamination is determined to be significant, representatives</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A, with the addition of the following:</i> <i>D. As part of the proposed wastewater treatment design, sodium hypochlorite and citric acid shall be stored in the chemical room of the wastewater treatment plant building. The chemical room shall</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Sub-Alternative A-1.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>N/A</i>

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
	<p><i>of STOF shall consult with the USEPA to determine the appropriate course of action, including the development of a sampling plan and remediation plan if necessary.</i></p> <p><i>B. All hazardous materials that would be necessary for the operation of the facilities shall be stored and handled according to State, Federal, and manufacturer's guidelines. All flammable liquids shall be stored in a labeled secured container.</i></p> <p><i>C. Personnel shall follow written standard operating procedures (SOP) for filling and servicing construction equipment and vehicles. The SOPs, which are designed to reduce the potential for incidents involving hazardous materials, shall include the following:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Refueling shall be conducted only with approved pumps, hoses, and nozzles.</i> <i>2. Catch-pans shall be placed under equipment to catch potential spills during servicing.</i> <i>3. All disconnected hoses shall be placed in containers to collect</i> 	<p><i>contain an emergency shower and eyewash.</i></p> <p><i>The storage and chemical metering facilities shall be located inside a chemical spill containment area, sized to contain 150% of the storage volume in case of an unintentional release.</i></p> <p><i>The sodium hypochlorite shall be stored in 55-gallon drums and the citric acid shall be stored as dry material and then in a 50-gallon mixing tank when needed. Both chemicals shall be transferred to the dip tanks using pumps.</i></p>			

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
	<p><i>residual fuel from the hose.</i></p> <p>4. <i>Vehicle engines shall be shut down during refueling.</i></p> <p>5. <i>No smoking, open flames, or welding shall be allowed in refueling or service areas.</i></p> <p>6. <i>Refueling shall be performed away from bodies of water to prevent contamination of water in the event of a leak or spill.</i></p> <p>7. <i>Service trucks shall be provided with fire extinguishers and spill containment equipment, such as absorbents.</i></p> <p>8. <i>Should a spill contaminate soil, the soil shall be put into containers and disposed of in accordance with local, State, and Federal regulations.</i></p> <p>9. <i>All containers used to store hazardous materials shall be inspected at least once per week for signs of leaking or failure. All maintenance and refueling areas shall be inspected monthly. Results of inspections shall be recorded in a</i></p>				

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
	<i>logbook that shall be maintained on site.</i>				
<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	LS	LS	LS	NE
Aesthetics					
<i>Visual Impacts</i>	<i>The 20-story hotel would be visible from the nearby sensitive receptors. While development on this site is consistent with long-range City plans for the area, it does represent a major alteration to the viewshed in the short-term. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>The 10-story hotel would reduce the impacts to visual resources as compared with Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	NE
<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Screening features may be integrated into the landscaping design of the alternatives to screen the view of the facilities to integrate natural elements into the design. This includes screening views for residents within a medium range southwest of the site.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	<i>Mitigation would be the same as for Alternative A.</i>	N/A
<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	LS	LS	LS	NE
<i>Shadow and Light</i>	<i>The development of this alternative would introduce new sources of light into the setting. However, through the use of downcast and directed lighting, low-pressure sodium bulbs, and strategically positioned lighting fixtures the impacts of lighting off-site would be minimized. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –LS</i>	NE

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
After Mitigation	LS	LS	LS	LS	NE
Glare	The use of glass panels and reflective detailing could increase the off-site glare. – PS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS	NE
Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
After Mitigation	PS	PS	PS	PS	NE
Community Character	Development of the hotel/resort would have no effect on the community character of the area. –NE	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –NE	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –NE	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –NE	NE
Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
After Mitigation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	NE
Indirect Impacts					
Off-Site Retention Ponds	STOF would expand off-site stormwater retention capacity as mitigation for the shortage of on-site storage. –PS	Off-site retention ponds would not be required –NE	Off-site retention ponds would not be required –NE	Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A –PS	NE
Mitigation	Mitigation Measures listed above under Cultural Resources and Hazardous Materials would be implemented. 5.2.4 E. Prior to the start of construction, a biologist will conduct a preconstruction survey of the site for the proposed 2.1-acre retention pond to ensure that no	N/A	N/A	Mitigation Measures recommended would be identical to those identified under Alternative A.	N/A

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
	<p><i>federally threatened or endangered species or potentially jurisdictional wetlands or waters of the U.S. occur on-site. Should the biologist determine that suitable habitat for and evidence of federally listed species occurs on-site, consultation with USFWS will be initiated in accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Should the biologist determine that potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. occur on-site within the area of impact, consultation with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will be initiated in accordance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.</i></p> <p><i>5.2.5 D. Prior to the start of construction, an archaeologist shall conduct a literature review and field reconnaissance to determine if there is a potential for cultural resources to be found on the site of the proposed stormwater retention pond. Should the archaeologist determine that cultural resources occur on-site appropriate consultation shall be initiated in compliance with applicable federal and state regulations.</i></p>				
<i>After Mitigation</i>	LS	N/A	N/A	LS	NE

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A

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

RESOURCE	ALTERNATIVE A	SUB-ALTERNATIVE A-1	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	SUB-ALTERNATIVE C-1
<i>Off-Traffic Improvements</i>	<i>Construction of off-site intersection improvements (listed as Mitigation in Section 5.2.7) could generate indirect impacts. –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –PS</i>	<i>NE</i>
<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures listed above under Geology and Soils, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Hazardous Materials would be implemented.</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures listed above under Geology and Soils, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Hazardous Materials would be implemented.</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures listed above under Geology and Soils, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Hazardous Materials would be implemented.</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures listed above under Geology and Soils, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Hazardous Materials would be implemented.</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>After Mitigation</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>NE</i>
<i>Optional Connection to Off-Site Water Supply</i>	<i>No indirect or growth inducing impacts would occur under Alternative A, as connection to Coconut Creek water supply infrastructure would occur–NE</i>	<i>Optional mitigation in Section 5.2.8 indicates that STOF may connect to a local municipal water distribution system in the event that a groundwater shortage or water quality issue prevents STOF from obtaining sufficient quantities of groundwater on site. –NE</i>	<i>Optional mitigation in Section 5.2.8 indicates that STOF may connect to a local municipal water distribution system in the event that a groundwater shortage or water quality issue prevents STOF from obtaining sufficient quantities of groundwater on site. –NE</i>	<i>Impacts would be the same as for Alternative A. –NE</i>	<i>NE</i>
<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures listed above under Geology and Soils, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Hazardous Materials would be implemented.</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures listed above under Geology and Soils, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Hazardous Materials would be implemented.</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>After Mitigation</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>LS</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>NE</i>

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

Significant = S

Potentially significant=PS

Less than significant = LS

Beneficial effect = BE

No effect = NE

Not applicable = N/A