

## PROJECT HISTORY-TIMELINE

Feb. 14, 2017	The Tribe hosts a press conference to announce that the property in Elk Grove has been taken into trust by the BIA.
Feb. 8, 2017	City Council repeals Ordinance No. 23-2016 nullifying the amendment to the development agreement.
Jan. 19, 2017	BIA issues Record of Decision approving the EIS allowing the Elk Grove site to be taken into trust. BIA notes that development agreement (Ordinance No. 23-2016) does not prohibit BIA from taking land into trust for the Tribe.
Jan. 11, 2017	City Council certifies referendum petition. Ordinance 23-2016 is suspended and not effective.
Dec. 14, 2016	BIA issues notice of availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Project, opening 30 day public comment period.
Nov. 21, 2016	Referendum petition filed with the City of Elk Grove seeking to repeal Ordinance No. 23-2016.
Oct 26, 2016	City of Elk Grove receives further public comment at a public meeting and adopts Ordinance No. 23-2016 amending development agreement with HHC.
Oct 12, 2016	City of Elk Grove holds a public hearing, receives public comment, and approves Ordinance No. 23-2016 amending development agreement with Howard Hughes Corporation (HHC) – the mall developer – removing the proposed Project site from the development agreement.
Sept. 28, 2016	At a public meeting of the City Council, and following public comment, Elk Grove City Council approves an MOU with the Tribe to mitigate impacts of the proposed Project including traffic, crime, schools and loss of tax revenue if the Project is approved by appropriate state and federal agencies and ultimately built. The MOU provides approximately \$132 million to the Elk Grove community over 20 years if the Project is built.
July 6, 2016	The Tribe conducts town hall-style meeting in Elk Grove at the Falls Event Center to receive community feedback and answer questions.
June 2016	City of Elk Grove and the Tribe begin discussions regarding a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to address impacts from the Project, consistent with the 2011 MOU.
June 9, 2016	Following environmental review and public comment, the Tribe announces Elk Grove as preferred site for proposed Resort and Casino project.
Feb. 29, 2016	Public comment period on DEIS concludes following 62-day public comment period.
Feb. 18, 2016	City of Elk Grove provides comments to the BIA regarding the DEIS.
Jan. 29, 2016	BIA conducts a public hearing in Galt to provide information and receive public comments on the proposed Project and DEIS.
Dec. 29, 2015	Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is published in the Federal Register by the BIA. The DEIS includes analysis of impacts from construction at the Galt, Elk Grove, and Wilton sites.
Dec. 4, 2013	BIA publishes a Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register describing the proposed action and announcing the BIA's intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Project. Alternative sites, including the current Elk Grove location and Wilton, are identified in the EIS.
2013	The Tribe submits an application to the BIA to take approximately 282 acres of land into trust near the City of Galt for gaming and other purposes.
June 2011	County of Sacramento, City of Elk Grove and Wilton Rancheria enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that outlines a process that requires the Tribe to negotiate agreements with the City and County to mitigate potential environmental, social, and economic impacts resulting from any future development projects, including a possible casino project proposed by the Tribe.
Feb. 2010	The Federal Court granted to the City and County the right to participate in the tribal restoration process.
Aug. 2009	The County of Sacramento and City of Elk Grove intervened in a pending federal lawsuit to provide input on the proposed casino location, expressing concern over the Wilton location.
2009	The Tribe proposes to construct a casino on property located near historic tribal land in Wilton.
June 2009	The United States restores federal recognition and government-to-government relationship with the Wilton Rancheria Tribe.

## PROJECT NEXT STEPS

In order to offer gambling as part of the Facility, a state gaming compact (agreement) must be approved by California's Governor and ratified by the California Legislature.

To learn more visit

[www.wiltoneis.com](http://www.wiltoneis.com) or [www.elkgrovecity.org](http://www.elkgrovecity.org)



# WILTON RANCHERIA CASINO RESORT PROJECT FAQ



## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) recently accepted into trust 36 acres of land for the benefit of the Wilton Rancheria Indian Tribe (Tribe) for the development of a proposed casino resort project in the City of Elk Grove. The land is located just north of the approved outlet mall site at the northwest portion of the intersection of Grant Line Road and SR-99.

The proposed project consists of a proposed 608,756 square foot hospitality and entertainment facility, including a 12-story 302 room hotel, pool, spa, 47,634-square-foot convention center, six restaurants and bars, and a 110,260 square foot gaming floor. More information about the project can be found on the Tribe's site [www.wiltonrancheria-nsn.gov](http://www.wiltonrancheria-nsn.gov).

The BIA's Record of Decision describing the decision making process and conclusions, and the Environmental Impact Statement for the project can be found at [www.wiltoneis.com](http://www.wiltoneis.com).

See inside for

FAQ 

# FAQ

## FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS REGARDING THE WILTON RANCHERIA PROJECT:

**Q** What role does the City of Elk Grove play in the review and approval of the Wilton Rancheria project?

**A** The proposed Wilton Rancheria casino resort project (Project) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) are undertakings of the Wilton Rancheria Tribe (Tribe) and the United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). The proposed Project and associated land use approvals were submitted to the federal government through the BIA for approval. The City is not approving, and has not approved, a casino Project. Even if the City objects to the Project and the taking of the land into trust with the federal government, the Project could still be built. However, the City and the Tribe acknowledge that there may be potential impacts to the community associated with the Project. In order to address those potential impacts, the City negotiated an agreement (available online), called a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), with the Tribe that will provide payments to the City, Elk Grove Unified School District, and local non-profits. The approval of that MOU is not an approval of the casino Project. The approval of the MOU simply provides that if the casino Project is approved by the federal government, and appropriate State of California agencies, and it is ultimately built, that the Tribe will be obligated to make payments to the City to address potential impacts and make up for taxes that would otherwise be paid by a project similar to the casino Project, if the Project were subject to local taxes.

**Q** What opportunities have been provided for public comment?

**A** As lead agency, the BIA is responsible for conducting all public outreach associated with the Project and the draft EIS. An initial public hearing on the draft EIS was held on January 29, 2016 in Galt, as part of a 62-day public comment period on the proposed Project. Following the announcement in June 2016 by the Tribe that the Elk Grove location was the preferred site, the Tribe conducted a town-hall styled meeting in Elk Grove on July 6, 2016 at the Falls Event Center to receive community feedback and answer questions about the Project. A copy of the presentation is available on the City's website. The City Council held a public meeting and received public comment on September 28, 2016 prior to its approval of the MOU. The Final Environmental Impact Statement was released by the BIA on December 14, 2016 and provided a final 30 day public comment period.

**Q** What impact would the Elk Grove location have on the Outlet Collection at Elk Grove mall project?

**A** The proposed casino Project location is north of the approved outlet mall site and does not restrict the mall project from moving forward. The Howard Hughes Corporation (HHC) – the developer of the outlet mall – continues to make progress on the development and leasing for The Outlet Collection at Elk Grove. HHC has indicated that the casino Project will help facilitate and expedite the leasing and construction of the mall. Please note: the outlet mall is not included in the trust land request; therefore, it will still be subject to all applicable state and local taxes and capital impact fees.

**Q** I am concerned about the impacts of the casino on our community, including loss of future tax revenue, public safety and traffic. What has the City done to address these concerns?

**A** The EIS presents an evaluation of the potential impacts associated with the casino Project including economic, socio-economic, traffic, public safety, natural resources, air quality and noise. The EIS can be found at [www.wiltoneis.com](http://www.wiltoneis.com). The Tribe will be obligated to comply with all environmental mitigation measures imposed on it by the federal government through the EIS process. Additionally, in order to mitigate the potential impacts of the Project identified in the EIS, the City and the Tribe have executed an MOU that provides funding to the City of Elk Grove, Elk Grove Unified School District and local non-profit organizations to pay for services such as law enforcement and traffic impacts and compensate for loss of tax revenue. The total cumulative payments from the Tribe to the community over 20 years is approximately \$132 million. This amount far exceeds that which the City would expect to receive from tax revenues associated with the mall. A copy of the staff report and MOU can be found online on the City's website. Sacramento County approved a similar agreement with the Tribe that mitigates impacts to the court system, county roads, and social services including problem gambling, drug and alcohol and domestic violence programs. As explained above, the approval of these agreements with the City and the County of Sacramento do not constitute approvals or disapprovals of the casino Project. Those approvals are subject to federal agency determinations, and the City and County lack jurisdiction to make such approvals.

**Q** What is the “Development Agreement Amendment” and what does it do?

**A** A development agreement is an agreement authorized by state law between a developer and a city entitling a developer to construct a certain project. A development agreement does not require the developer to construct a project, but rather gives the developer certain rights to do so, if the developer so chooses, consistent with the terms of the agreement. In October of 2014, Howard Hughes Corporation (HHC), the developer for the mall site, received approvals for a development agreement that would provide for the development of an outlet mall on the southern portion of an approximately 100 acre site in the City. The northern portion of the site remained unplanned and subject to future potential development to be determined. In August of 2016, HHC applied to the City for an amendment to the development agreement to lift the development agreement entitlements from approximately 35 acres of the northern portion of the site. Following public hearings and public comment, the City adopted Ordinance 23-2016 approving that development agreement amendment on October 26, 2016. The approval of that development agreement amendment is not a vote or approval for or against the casino Project. It only amends a development agreement between the City and the HHC – the mall developer. As explained above, the City does not have approval authority over the casino Project. A copy of Ordinance 23-2016 approving the development agreement amendment can be seen online. On February 8, 2017, the City Council repealed Ordinance 23-2016 nullifying the amendment to the development agreement, satisfying the request of referendum petitioners.