

APPENDIX H

Notes from Scoping Meetings with Local Jurisdictions

City of Rohnert Park Meeting Notes

Date

October 18, 2005

Attendees

Jake Mackenzie, Mayor, City of Rohnert Park

Vicki Vidak Martinez, Vice Mayor, City of Rohnert Park

Stephen Donley, City Manager, City of Rohnert Park

Gabrielle Whelan, Assistant City Attorney, City of Rohnert Park

Brad Mehaffy, NEPA Compliance Officer, National Indian Gaming Commission

Greg Sarris, Tribal Chairman, Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria

Lorelle Ross, Vice-Chair, Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria

John Maier, Tribal Attorney, Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria

Chad Broussard, Senior Associate, Analytical Environmental Services

Notes

Note that this is not intended to be an exact transcript of the October 18, 2005 meeting, but an outline of issues rose by the City of Rohnert Park at the meeting.

- City would like ten copies of any handouts given at the public scoping meeting.
 - AES provided dozens of extra handout copies to Stephen Donley after the public scoping meeting.
- City is concerned that a lot of misinformation is being spread about the project and the various legal processes surrounding the project.
 - Asked the NIGC to respond to a memo asking for additional information about the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) as they related to the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria's (Tribe) proposed project. These answers would help the City accurately respond to questions from the public.
 - Mr. Mehaffy asked for a formal request from the City that he would provide to National Indian Gaming Commission (NIGC) legal counsel for consideration and response. Mr. Donley agreed to do so.
- City questioned whether the fee-to-trust action was a major federal action under NEPA in this case.
 - NIGC responded that the fee-to-trust action was not a major federal action under NEPA in this case and explained why this was the case.
- City questioned the compacting process, and specifically what the Tribe would do if the California legislature does not ratify their tribal-state compact.
 - Tribe responded that various legal options would be available, including a lawsuit for failure to negotiate in good faith, and the institution of "Secretarial procedures" where compacting requirements are satisfied through the Secretary of the Interior instead of the state.
- City stated that during the public presentation the steps of the NEPA process should be discussed.
- City inquired about current cooperating agencies.

- City concerned somewhat that the development of the new site for a casino/hotel resort is not consistent with their zoning. However, they Mr. Donley noted that since the land is already proposed for intensive development (unlike the old proposed site) the City has no environmental concerns.
- City is interested in seeing the impact of the project on water and wastewater operations analyzed in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
- City stated that it might have additional comments on water and wastewater impacts after reviewing the Draft EIS during the Draft EIS comment period.

Sonoma County Meeting Notes

Date

October 19, 2005

Attendees

Bruce Goldstein, Assistant County Counsel, Sonoma County
Chris Thomas, Deputy County Administrator, Sonoma County
Jeff Brax, Deputy County Counsel, Sonoma County
Pete Parkinson, Director, Sonoma County Permits & Resource Management Department
Steve Sharpe, County Administrator / LAFCO, Sonoma County
Brad Mehaffy, NEPA Compliance Officer, National Indian Gaming Commission
Greg Sarris, Tribal Chairman, Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria
Lorelle Ross, Vice-Chair, Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria
John Maier, Tribal Attorney, Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria
Chad Broussard, Senior Associate, Analytical Environmental Services

Notes

Note that this is not intended to be an exact transcript of the October 19, 2005 meeting, but an outline of issues rose by Sonoma County at the meeting.

- County asked for information about the project and the various technical reports that were underway for the project. In its capacity as cooperating agency, the County would like to start reviewing technical reports as soon as possible prior to reviewing the full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).
 - Analytical Environmental Services (AES) responded with a description of the project and the new site. AES also gave an update on the number and status of technical reports and agreed to make them available to the County subject to the approval of the National Indian Gaming Commission (NIGC).
- County is concerned about impacts to water quality and to local water and wastewater services.
- County inquired as to the various wastewater options that would be considered and whether City hook-up would be an option.
 - AES responded with a description of the options expected to be included in the EIS as of the date of the meeting.
- County inquired as to the purpose of the new scoping process.
 - NIGC responded that this was an extension of the existing process to include the new site.
- County questioned whether their scoping comments should be limited to the new alternative?
 - NIGC responded that the intent of the extended scoping process is to take comments on the new alternative, although other comments will continue to be considered as well.
- County questioned whether the BIA was still involved in the project?
 - NIGC responded that they are involved as a cooperating agency.

- County stated that the new site is a better site from a land use perspective. Otherwise their original scoping comments should still apply.
- County stated that the City of Rohnert Park's Water Assessment is currently the subject of controversy. County recommended that the NIGC contact Jay Jaspers at the SCWA. The SCWA is beginning a groundwater study and should have information for the NIGC on water resources.
- County suggested that the Tribe consider using off-site water supplies instead of using on-site groundwater wells.
- County suggested that the Draft EIS be circulated to the LAFCO.
- County inquired as to the remaining fee-to-trust and management contracting process.
 - Mr. Maier went through the remaining processes.
- County inquired as to whether the California Environmental Quality Act would apply
 - Mr. Maier stated that it might apply at a later date should off-site water or wastewater options be chosen. Mr. Mehaffy agreed.