

# **Appendix INT-1**

---

## **Initial Study**

**COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**  
**PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW DIVISION**  
**INITIAL STUDY**

## **1.1 PROJECT INFORMATION**

**CONTROL NUMBER:** PLNP2011-00095

**NAME:** JACKSON TOWNSHIP SPECIFIC PLAN

**LOCATION:** The Plan Area is located on 1,391 acres in central Sacramento County, approximately 2 miles south and 1.5 miles west of the City of Rancho Cordova. The Plan Area is primarily located within the Vineyard community, but the portion north of Kiefer Boulevard is located within the Cordova community.

**ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBERS:** 067-0050-002, -004, -005, -019, -020, -021, -022, -028, -029, -045, -047, -051, -058, 067-0060-007, -008, -010, -011, -012, -013, -014, -016, 067-0070-002, 067-0080-004, -023, -028, -031, -032, -033, -034, -040, -042, -045, -048, -049, -050, -051, -057, and -061.

**OWNER:** There are 24 different landowners within the Plan Area, the largest of which is the Applicant, Tsakopoulos Investments, which owns 862 acres (62%) of land within the Plan Area.

**APPLICANT:** Tsakopoulos Investments, represented by Angelo G. Tsakopoulos.

## **1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The proposed Project includes a land use plan that would provide for a range of different uses, including Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, General Commercial, Community Commercial, Mixed Use, Office, schools, a fire station, parks, a wetland preserve, a greenbelt/drainage corridor, landscaping, detention, agriculture, and associated roadways.

Overall, the Project includes 6,143 residential units of varying densities, including 100 units within a mixed use area, as well as nearly two million square feet of commercial, retail, and non-residential mixed use space.

The Project is designed to promote non-vehicular travel, including biking, walking, and use of transit. The land plan includes two "hubs" with higher densities and more mixes of uses, including a Town Center located along Jackson Road and a smaller Village Center located at the intersection of Excelsior Road and Kiefer Boulevard. The Village Center would serve the proposed Project, future development in the West Jackson Highway Master Plan Area to the west, and the existing Independence at Mather subdivision, which is currently isolated from services. Most of the homes developed within the Plan Area would be located within 1.4 miles of parks, schools, transit lines, and either the Town Center or Village Center.

The applicant is also proposing three other alternatives that are generally similar to the proposed Project, with slight variations. For the most part, the alternatives are similar, but Alternative 1A includes more Office space, Alternative 1B changes the configuration of the land uses in the Village Center, and Alternative 1C is a combination of the two.

See the Project Description and Alternatives chapters in the EIR for detailed descriptions of the proposed Project and all of the Alternatives.

## 1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Plan Area is currently designated as Extensive Industrial, General Agriculture 20 (minimum parcel sizes of 20 acres), and a small area of Urban Reserve on the Sacramento General Plan Land Use Diagram and zoned Light Industrial (M-1), Agricultural 80 (AG-80), and Interim Agricultural Reserve (IR).

The Plan Area is largely undeveloped. Current land uses on the properties within the Plan Area are predominantly for grazing, small ranches, and agricultural-residential homes. A portion of the Plan Area includes the Sacramento Raceway, which hosts regular stock car and drag racing events several times a month throughout the year.

To the west of the Plan area, land uses are characterized by agricultural uses, mining activities, and commercial sales of landscaping materials. Lands to the east are generally similar to the Plan Area, with grazing and agricultural-residential uses predominating. The property to the east also includes the Sacramento Rendering Company plant, a facility that accepts animal tissue, processes it, and then distributes the byproduct for use in the manufacture of other goods. Land to the north is dominated by the presence of Mather Airport and appurtenant facilities, and includes the Independence at Mather residential subdivision and a wetland and nature preserve. Mather Golf Course is located further to the northeast. Properties to the south of the Plan Area on the opposite side of Jackson Highway are generally in agricultural or agricultural-residential use or are within a wetland preserve.

Most of the Plan Area site is grassland with interspersed wetlands; portions of the site have historically been disturbed by agricultural activities. The southwestern portion of the Plan Area is within the headwaters of Elder Creek, and a small bend in Morrison Creek runs through the northeastern corner of the Plan Area.

## 1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provides guidance for assessing the significance of potential environmental impacts. Based on this guidance, Sacramento County has developed an Initial Study Checklist. The Checklist identifies a range of potential significant effects by topical area.

Due to the size and scope of the Project, it is known that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be required. This Initial Study Checklist has been used to scope the EIR, by focusing out minor issues that do not warrant the more in-depth and detailed explanation that will be found in the EIR. Therefore, when an impact has been determined to be a more complicated issue that needs to be analyzed in more detail, the Checklist identifies that impact as a potentially significant impact and refers the reader to the EIR with little additional information. In addition, although some impacts are identified as less than significant in the Checklist, the impact may refer the reader to the EIR if the topic may be controversial or require more explanation than would be appropriate in the Checklist. Detailed topical discussions are not included in this Checklist. The reader should refer to the technical sections of the EIR for additional analysis.

## 1.5 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provides guidance for assessing the significance of potential environmental impacts. Based on this guidance, Sacramento County has developed the following Initial Study Checklist. The Checklist identifies a range of potential significant effects by topical area. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to impacts as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act as follows:

- 1 Potentially Significant indicates there is substantial evidence that an effect MAY be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant" entries an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required. Further research of a potentially significant impact may reveal that the impact is actually less than significant or less than significant with mitigation.
- 2 Less than Significant with Mitigation applies where an impact could be significant but specific mitigation has been identified that reduces the impact to a less than significant level.
- 3 Less than Significant or No Impact indicates that either a project will have an impact but the impact is considered minor or that a project does not impact the particular resource.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
<b>1. LAND USE - Would the project:</b>				
a. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to a general plan, specific plan or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	X			A full evaluation of the Project's consistency with other land use plans, policies, or regulations intended to avoid or mitigate environmental effects will be included in the EIR.
b. Physically disrupt or divide an established community?			X	The Project would result in the development of a new community in an area that is currently undeveloped, but is located near other planned development areas. As such, it will not create physical barriers that substantially limit movement within or through the community. Therefore, there would be no impact, and this will not be further analyzed in the EIR.
<b>2. POPULATION/HOUSING - Would the project:</b>				
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of infrastructure)?	X			The Project proposes the establishment of a new major development area that is not currently located within the Urban Policy Area (UPA), but is located within the Urban Services Boundary (USB). One of the entitlement requests is an amendment of the UPA to allow for the expansion of the UPA area. Expansion of the UPA and approval of the proposed Project would directly induce substantial population growth. This impact will be addressed in the EIR.
b. Displace substantial amounts of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	The project will result in the removal of a few existing agricultural residential dwellings, but includes the creation of 6,143 total dwellings, resulting in a net increase in housing stock. This is a less-than-significant impact, and will not be further addressed in the EIR.
<b>3. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:</b>				

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or areas containing prime soils to uses not conducive to agricultural production?	X			The Plan Area contains some Prime Farmland (as noted on the current Sacramento County Important Farmland Map published by the California Department of Conservation), and implementation of the Project would convert it to non-agricultural uses. The Plan Area also contains Farmland of Local Importance and land designated for Grazing by the California Department of Conservation. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
b. Conflict with any existing Williamson Act contract?	X			There are Williamson Act contracts in effect for portions of the Plan Area, but each contract is in Nonrenewal status. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
c. Introduce incompatible uses in the vicinity of existing agricultural uses?	X			The Project is located on property that is currently in agricultural production and in the vicinity of other properties in agricultural production. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
<b>4. AESTHETICS - Would the project:</b>				
a. Substantially alter existing viewsheds such as scenic highways, corridors or vistas?	X			The project does not occur in the vicinity of any designated scenic highways, corridors, or vistas, but it is visible from many major roadways. Furthermore, the Project would substantially change the visual character of the Plan Area from undeveloped agricultural land to an urbanized suburban community. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
b. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	X			Approval of the Project would allow for a new major development project in an area that is currently undeveloped and agricultural in nature. This would result in a substantial change in the visual character of the site and its surroundings. This impact will be addressed in the EIR.
c. Create a new source of substantial light, glare, or shadow that would result in safety hazards or adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	X			The project will result in new sources of light and glare as the Plan Area would be developed with 6,143 new homes and nearly 2 million square feet of new businesses. This could potentially result in an effect on day and nighttime views of the area. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
<b>5. AIRPORTS - Would the project:</b>				
a. Result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of an airport/airstrip?	X			The project is located within the overflight zone of Mather Airport. This impact is analyzed in the EIR.
b. Expose people residing or working in the project area to aircraft noise levels in excess of applicable standards?	X			The project is located in the vicinity of Mather Airport and may be located within one of its noise contours. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
c. Result in a substantial adverse effect upon the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft?	X			The project is located in the vicinity of Mather Airport. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
d. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			X	The project does not involve or affect air traffic movement. There would be no impact, and this is not addressed further in the EIR.
<b>6. PUBLIC SERVICES - Would the project:</b>				
a. Have an adequate water supply for full buildout of the project?	X			The Project will result in the development of a new urban community that would require connection to water services. This may require new additional water supplies. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
b. Have adequate wastewater treatment and disposal facilities for full buildout of the project?	X			The Project will result in the development of a new urban community that would require connections to wastewater treatment and disposal services. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
c. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	X			The Kiefer Landfill has capacity to accommodate solid waste until the year 2030. However, the buildout and continued operation of the proposed Project will extend beyond 2030. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
d. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the construction of new water supply or wastewater treatment and disposal facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	X			The Project will result in the development of a new urban community that would require connection to a public water supply. This may require the construction of new or expanded infrastructure for water supply delivery or wastewater treatment and/or disposal. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
e. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of storm water drainage facilities?	X			The Project would result in the development of a new urban community in an area that is currently undeveloped. This will result in the need for new storm water drainage facilities. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
f. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of electric or natural gas service?	X			The Project will result in the development of a new urban community in a currently undeveloped location, which will require electric and natural gas service and development of the associated delivery infrastructure. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
g. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of emergency services?	X			The Project would result in the development of a new urban community that would incrementally increase the demand for emergency services within the Plan Area. The Project includes the development of new fire station that would assist in providing emergency services to the Plan Area and surrounding areas. Development of the fire station is considered as part of the analysis of the potential physical impacts on the environment. However, additional facilities could possibly be required, the construction of which could have an adverse effect on the physical environment. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
h. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of public school services?	X			The Project includes the development of three elementary schools and one middle school/high school campus. These schools would serve students generated by directly by the Project and surrounding areas. The EIR will analyze whether additional school facilities are necessary. The EIR also analyzes the physical environmental impacts associated with development of each of the proposed school sites.
i. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of park and recreation services?	X			The Project will result in increased demand for park and recreation services, but it will provide for the development of 73.3 acres of developed parkland, as well as wetland preserve, greenbelt corridors, and landscaping. The EIR will analyze whether the developed parkland acreage is sufficient to meet requirements. The EIR considers the physical impacts associated within the development of the onsite parks in its analysis.
<b>7. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project:</b>				

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
a. Result in a substantial increase in vehicle trips that would exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County?	X			A Traffic Impact Study is being prepared for the Project. Due to the scale of development, there will be a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips to and from the Plan Area. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
b. Result in a substantial adverse impact to access and/or circulation?			X	The Project will be required to comply with applicable access and circulation requirements of the County Improvement Standards and the Uniform Fire Code. Upon compliance, impacts are less than significant. Nonetheless, this impact will be fully analyzed in the EIR.
c. Result in a substantial adverse impact to public safety on area roadways?			X	The Project will be required to comply with applicable access and circulation requirements of the County Improvement Standards and the Uniform Fire Code. Upon compliance, impacts are less than significant. This impact will be further addressed in the EIR.
d. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X	The Project includes infrastructure and plans to provide for the support of alternative transportation, including bicycles and public transit. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
<b>8. AIR QUALITY - Would the project:</b>				
a. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	X			The Project would result in the development of a new 1,391-acre urban community, which exceeds the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's screening thresholds for criteria pollutants. Therefore, a full analysis and air quality modeling will be completed as part of the EIR to determine the Project's potential impact.
b. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations in excess of standards?	X			The Project includes the development of four schools, thousands of residences that could be sensitive receptors. Furthermore, other projects in the area would contain similar uses. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
c. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	X			The Project does not include the development of uses that would generate objectionable odors. However, the Plan Area is located approximately 1.5 miles west the Sacramento Rendering Company, which has been the source of complaints of detectable odors. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
<b>9. NOISE - Would the project:</b>				
a. Result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established by the local general plan, noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?	X			A portion of the Plan Area contains the Sacramento Raceway, which currently generates substantial noise. Although the raceway is part of the Plan Area, it is not owned by the applicant, so operations could continue preliminary phases of construction on properties that are owned by the applicant. This impact will be addressed in the EIR.
b. Result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity?			X	Project construction will result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity. This impact is less than significant due to the temporary nature of the these activities, limits on the duration of noise, and evening and nighttime restrictions imposed by the County Noise Ordinance (Chapter 6.68 of the County Code). Nonetheless, this impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
<b>10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:</b>				
a. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or substantially interfere with groundwater recharge?	X			The Project will be served by the Sacramento County Water Agency Zone 40, which is served by groundwater sources. Therefore, the Project will incrementally add to groundwater consumption. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.  Although the Project would result in the development of 1,391 acres that are currently largely undeveloped, the Plan Area is not located in an area of significant recharge capability. Groundwater recharge is not further addressed in the EIR.
b. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project area and/or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	The Project would alter the site's current drainage patterns by channelizing existing drainages and add urban development that could result in additional surface runoff if stormwater infrastructure is not designed and built properly.  Compliance with applicable requirements of the Sacramento County Floodplain Management Ordinance, Sacramento County Water Agency Code, and Sacramento County Improvement Standards will ensure that impacts are less than significant. Nonetheless, this impact will be analyzed in the EIR.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
c. Develop within a 100-year floodplain as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map or within a local flood hazard area?	X			Portions of the Plan Area are within the 100-year floodplain. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
d. Place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year floodplain?	X			See response 10c. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
e. Expose people or structures to a substantial risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	X			See response 10c. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
f. Create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?			X	See response 10b. Adequate on- and/or off-site drainage improvements will be required pursuant to the Sacramento County Floodplain Management Ordinance and Improvement Standards. Nonetheless, this impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
g. Create substantial sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade ground or surface water quality?			X	Compliance with the Stormwater Ordinance and Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance (Chapters 15.12 and 14.44 of the County Code respectively) will ensure that the Project will not create substantial sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade ground or surface water quality. This impact will be less than significant and will not be further addressed in the EIR.
<b>11. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:</b>				
a. Expose people or structures to substantial risk of loss, injury or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?			X	Sacramento County is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Although there are no known active earthquake faults in the project area, the site could be subject to some ground shaking from regional faults. The Uniform Building Code contains applicable construction regulations for earthquake safety that will ensure less than significant impacts. This impact will not be further addressed in the EIR.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
b. Result in substantial soil erosion, siltation or loss of topsoil?			X	Compliance with the County's Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance will reduce the amount of construction site erosion and minimize water quality degradation by providing stabilization and protection of disturbed areas, and by controlling the runoff of sediment and other pollutants during the course of construction. This will be addressed in more detail in the EIR.
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, soil expansion, liquefaction or collapse?			X	Pursuant to Title 16 of the Sacramento County Code and the Uniform Building Code, a soils report will be required prior to building construction. If the soils report indicates than soils may be unstable for building construction then site-specific measures (e.g., special engineering design or soil replacement) must be incorporated to ensure that soil conditions will be satisfactory for the proposed construction. Although this would ensure that the impact would be less than significant with compliance with the Sacramento County Code and Uniform Building Code, this impact will be addressed in more detail in the EIR.
d. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available?			X	The Project will be required to connect to the public sewer system. There will be no impact. This will not be further addressed in the EIR.
e. Result in a substantial loss of an important mineral resource?			X	The project is not located within an Aggregate Resource Area as identified by the Sacramento County General Plan Land Use Diagram, nor are any important mineral resources known to be located within the Plan Area. There are areas identified as mineral resource areas directly northwest of the Plan Area, but not within the Plan Area itself. However, due to its proximity to mining activities, the EIR will address this impact in more detail.
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?			X	No known paleontological resources (e.g. fossil remains) or sites occur at the project location. There would be no impact. This will not be further addressed in the EIR.
<b>12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:</b>				

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, or threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community?	X			The project site may contain suitable habitat for some special status species. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities?	X			The project site may contain riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on streams, wetlands, or other surface waters that are protected by federal, state, or local regulations and policies?	X			There are wetlands located within the Plan Area. The Project includes a large wetland preserve area to preserve some of the wetlands, but the Project would still result in a loss of wetlands in other portions of the Plan Area. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
d. Have a substantial adverse effect on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species?	X			Resident and/or migratory wildlife may be displaced by project construction, and the development of a new urban community in a currently undeveloped location could permanently displace migratory wildlife species. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
e. Adversely affect or result in the removal of native or landmark trees?	X			Native and/or landmark trees may occur within the Plan Area, and if so, are likely to be affected by construction. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
f. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources?			X	The project is consistent with local policies/ordinances protecting biological resources. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
g. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, state or federal plan for the conservation of habitat?	X			The County is in the process of preparing the South Sacramento County Habitat Conservation Plan, and the Project's wetland preservation area is part of that plan's preservation strategy.  It is also worth noting that portions of the Plan Area are located within an area known as the Mather core area, which has been identified by the US Fish and Wildlife Services as a priority recovery area for several species that rely on vernal pool habitat. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
<b>13. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:</b>				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource?		X		A cultural resources study has been completed for the Project. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on an archaeological resource?		X		No archaeological resources are known to occur within the Plan Area. The Northern California Information Center was contacted as part of a 2008 archaeological inventory study prepared for the properties owned by the applicant. The record search indicated that there were no recorded archaeological resources located within or adjacent to those properties. Some resources have been recorded on other properties nearby. Standard mitigation would ensure that impacts would be less than significant if any previously unknown archaeological resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities within the Plan Area. This impact will be further addressed in the EIR.
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		No known human remains are known to exist within the Plan Area. Nonetheless, mitigation has been recommended to ensure appropriate treatment should remains be uncovered during project implementation. This will be addressed in the EIR.
d. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074?	X			The Native American Heritage Commission has indicated that there are no known Sacred Land listings within the Plan Area. Several cultural resources studies have been prepared, and Native American tribes were contacted in 2007 and again in 2013 to notify them of the proposed Project. A response was received in 2007 from the lone Band of Miwok Indians and others were received in 2013 from the United Auburn Indian Community and the Shingle Springs Rancheria. None of the responses indicated that known tribal resources were located within the Plan Area, but they indicated that there could be resources. All of the letters requested additional information and to be kept up to date on the project. This impact will be addressed in the EIR.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
<b>14. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b> - Would the project:				
a. Create a substantial hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	The Project would not involve the transport, use, or disposal of major quantities of hazardous materials, but smaller quantities could potentially be used during construction and operation of the Project. It is possible that a portion of the Plan Area could be developed with medical offices, which may use and store small quantities of hazardous materials. Transport, use, storage, and disposal of these materials are highly regulated, so adverse effects are unlikely, and this would be a less-than-significant impact. Nonetheless, this impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
b. Expose the public or the environment to a substantial hazard through reasonably foreseeable upset conditions involving the release of hazardous materials?	X			The Project does not include the development of any uses that would create a substantial hazard to the public. However, the presence of the Sacramento Raceway could create some hazardous conditions for surrounding development if it continues operating, particularly since it the property has a history of violations concerning hazardous materials and hazardous conditions. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	X			The Project includes the development of four schools. This impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
d. Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, resulting in a substantial hazard to the public or the environment?			X	The project is not located on a known hazardous materials site, so this impact would be less than significant. Nonetheless, this will be addressed in the EIR.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant or No Impact	Comments
e. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan?			X	The project would not interfere with any known emergency response or evacuation plan, so this impact would be less than significant. However, commenters on the Notice of Preparation expressed concerns that emergency responders would have difficulty differentiating between the Plan Area and the City of Jackson, due to similar names, and therefore not be able to locate people in need of emergency services. Therefore, this impact will be addressed in the EIR.
<b>15. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:</b>				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	X			The Project has been designed to minimize greenhouse gas emissions to assist the County in meeting its greenhouse gas emission reduction goals. However, due to the large scale of the project, this impact will be fully analyzed in the EIR.

## 1.6 SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

LAND USE CONSISTENCY	Current Land Use Designation	Consistent	Not Consistent	Comments
General Plan	Extensive Industrial, General Agriculture (20 AC)		X	The Project requests entitlements to amend the General Plan designations for the Plan Area.
Community Plan	AG-80, IR, M-1		X	The Project requests entitlements to amend the Community Plan designations for the Plan Area.
Land Use Zone	M-1, AG-80, IR		X	The Project requests entitlements to amend the zoning for the Plan Area.

## 1.7 INITIAL STUDY PREPARERS

Environmental Coordinator: Catherine Hack

Assistant Environmental Coordinator: Tim Hawkins