

- 
1. **Project title and File Number:** Tentative Tract No. 82830 (formerly TTM 72648)  
Tentative Tract No. 82831 (formerly TTM 72649)
  2. **Lead agency name and address:** City of Lancaster  
Development Services Department  
Community Development Division  
44933 Fern Avenue  
Lancaster, California 93534
  3. **Contact person and phone number:** Mitzi Alvarado, Planner  
(661) 723-6100
  4. **Location:** A total of 9.77± acres divided between two sites:
    - Site 1: 6.5 ± gross acres located at the northeast corner of 65<sup>th</sup> Street West and Newgrove Street (TTM 82830) (APN 3203-008-045)
    - Site 2: 3.27 ± gross acres located at the northwest corner of Newgrove Street and future 62<sup>nd</sup> Street West (TTM 82831) (APN 3203-008-046)
  5. **Applicant name and address:** 99 Serenade Lancaster, LLC  
3470 Wilshire Blvd. Suite 1020  
Los Angeles, CA 90010
  6. **General Plan designation:** UR (Urban Residential)
  7. **Zoning:** R-7,000 (Single Family Residential on 7,000 Square Foot Lots)
  8. **Description of project:**

The proposed projects consist of two residential subdivisions totaling 34 single family residential lots in the R-7,000 zone: TTM 82830 and 82831. TTM 82830 is approximately 6.5 acres and would involve the construction of 22 single family residential lots. TTM 82831 is approximately 3.27 acres and would involve the construction of 12 single family residential lots.

**9. Surrounding land uses and setting:**

The property surrounding Site 1 is vacant except for the property to the south which is partially developed with a residential subdivision (TTM 60294). The properties to the north and west are designated NU (Non-Urban Residential) and are zoned RR-2.5 (single family residential, one dwelling unit per 2.5 acres). The properties to the south and east are designated as UR and zoned R-7,000.

The property surrounding Site 2 is vacant except for the land to the southwest which is partially developed (TTM 60294). South of the Site 2 is an approved undeveloped tract (TTM 61118). The property to the north is designated NU and zoned RR-2.5. The property to the west and south is designated UR and zoned R-7,000. The property to the east is designated LI (Light Industrial) and zoned LI. Additionally, the Mira Loma State Prison facility is located less than a quarter mile east of Site 2, on the eastern side of 60<sup>th</sup> Street West. Table 1 provides a summary of the zoning and land uses of the properties immediately adjacent to the project sites.

**Table 1**  
**Zoning/Land Use Information**

| <b>Direction</b> | <b>Zoning</b> | <b>General Plan Land Use Designation</b> | <b>Land Use</b>            |
|------------------|---------------|--|----------------------------|
| <b>Site 1</b>    |               |  |                            |
| <b>North</b>     | RR-2.5        | NU                                       | Vacant                     |
| <b>South</b>     | R-7,000       | UR                                       | Single-Family Homes        |
| <b>West</b>      | RR-2.5        | NU                                       | Vacant                     |
| <b>East</b>      | R-7,000       | UR                                       | Vacant                     |
| <b>Site 2</b>    |               |  |                            |
| <b>North</b>     | RR-2.5        | NU                                       | Vacant                     |
| <b>South</b>     | R-7,000       | UR                                       | Single-Family Homes/Vacant |
| <b>West</b>      | R-7,000       | UR                                       | Vacant                     |
| <b>East</b>      | LI            | LI                                       | Vacant                     |

- 10.** Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

Approvals from other public agencies for the proposed project include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD)
- Los Angeles County Fire Department
- Los Angeles Waterworks District 40 (annexation)
- Southern California Edison
- Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (annexation)

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

In accordance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52, the City sent letters to a total of five tribes that were identified by the Native American Heritage Commission or had directly contacted the City for notification via certified, return receipt mail on May 3, 2019. These letters included copies of the site plan, cultural resources report, and an aerial photograph. Table 2 identifies the tribe, the individual to whom the letter was directed, and the date the letter was received.

**Table 2**  
**Tribal Notification**

| <b>Tribe</b>                                     | <b>Person/Title</b>                             | <b>Date Received</b> |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians      | Rudy Ortega Jr. / Tribal President              | May 7, 2019          |
| San Manuel Band of Mission Indians               | Lynn Valbuena                                   | May 8, 2019          |
| Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation | Andrew Salas / Chairman                         | May 8, 2019          |
| San Manuel Band of Mission Indians               | Lee Clauss / Director of Cultural Resources     | May 8, 2019          |
| Kitanenmuk & Yowlumne Tejon Indians              | Delia Dominguez / Chairperson                   | Returned             |
| Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians                   | Joseph Ontiveros / Cultural Resource Department | May 8, 2019          |

Responses were received from the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians. The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians did not express any concerns related to the project; however, they requested that specific mitigation measures be incorporated which address procedures to be followed in the event that prehistoric cultural resources are encountered during construction. These measures have been identified under the cultural resources section on pages 25-26.

The Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians requested a meeting to discuss the project. A conference call was held between City staff and representatives of the tribe to discuss the proposed project and the City sent the tribe additional information. While a geotechnical report was not available, the tribe was connected with the developer's engineer to answer questions. As a result, specific mitigation measures were requested and have been included in the cultural resources section.



**Figure 1, Project Location Map (now TTMs 82830/82831)**

| SUMMARY OF EXISTING QUANTITIES                   |                 |                 |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| ITEM   | QTY./CUBIC YDS. | QTY./CUBIC YDS. |
| 1. LAND ACQUISITION PREMIUM FOR PUBLIC USE (EAS) | 180             | 12,925          |
| 2. SUBMERSE SUEDS - 6\"/>                        |                 |                 |

SCALE: 1"=60'

0 40 60

**Figure 2, Conceptual Site Plan – TTM 82830**



[illegible]

**Figure 3, Conceptual Site Plan – TTM 82831**

## ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

|                          |                           |                          |                                    |                          |                                    |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Aesthetics                | <input type="checkbox"/> | Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> | Air Quality                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Biological Resources      | <input type="checkbox"/> | Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Energy                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Geology/Soils             | <input type="checkbox"/> | Greenhouse Gas Emissions           | <input type="checkbox"/> | Hazards & Hazardous Materials      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Hydrology/Water Quality   | <input type="checkbox"/> | Land Use/Planning                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | Mineral Resources                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Noise                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | Population/Housing                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Services                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Recreation                | <input type="checkbox"/> | Transportation                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | Tribal Cultural Resources          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> | Wildfire                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | Mandatory Findings of Significance |

## DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

for   
Mitzi Alvarado, Planner

4/15/20

Date

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a. Earlier Analysis Use. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.



- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| I. <u>AESTHETICS</u> . Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:  |                                |                                       |                              |           |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?   |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings with a state scenic highway?  |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality or public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views of the area?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |

- a. The City of Lancaster General Plan identifies scenic areas in the City and immediately surrounding area (LMEA p. 12-1 to 12-3 and Figure 12-1). These scenic vistas include views of Quartz Hill (Scenic Area 3) and the Foothill Area (Scenic Area 1). Additionally, views of the open desert and mountains surrounding the valley are available from the project sites. With implementation of the proposed projects, the available views of type identified scenic resources would not change and would continue to be available from the roadways and area surrounding the project sites. Therefore, as a result of the proposed projects no impacts to scenic vistas would occur.
- b. The project sites do not contain any rock outcroppings, trees or historic buildings and are not located along a scenic highway. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- c. Development of the proposed projects would change the visual character of the project sites from vacant desert to two residential subdivisions totaling 34 lots. The new development would conform to design standards for structures and would be compatible with nearby developments. The proposed projects would also be in conformance with the City's General Plan and zoning

requirements for the area. Therefore, it has been determined that impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.

- d. Currently, no light is generated on the project sites. Light generated in the area is primarily from vehicles headlights, street lights, residential uses to the south, and the Mira Loma Detection Facility. The light generated from the project sites would be in the form of motor vehicles, street lights and residential lighting. The proposed street lights within the development would be directed onto the project sites. Additionally, the proposed projects would not introduce substantial amounts of glare as the development would be constructed primarily from non-reflective materials. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| II. <u>AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.</u> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project: |                                |                                       |                              |           |
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?  |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?  |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?  |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?  |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?  |                                |                                       |                              | X         |

- a. The California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), tracks and categorizes land with respect to agricultural resources. Land is designated as one of the following and each has a specific

definition: Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance, Grazing Land, Urban and Built-Up Land, and Other Land.

The Los Angeles County Farmland Map was last updated in 2018; however, the 2018 version has not been published yet. Based on the 2016 map, the project sites are designated as Other Land. Other land is defined as “land not included in any other mapping category. Common examples include low density rural developments, brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing, confined livestock, poultry, or aquaculture facilities, strip mines, borrow pits, water bodies smaller than 40 acres. Vacant and non-agricultural land surrounded on all sides by urban development and greater than 20 acres is mapped as other land.” As the project sites are not designated as farmland of importance by the State nor are they currently utilized for agricultural purposes, no impacts to agricultural resources would occur.

- b. The project sites are zoned R-7,000, which does not allow for agricultural uses. Additionally, the project sites and surrounding area are not utilized for agricultural uses nor are they subject to a Williamson Act contract. No agricultural uses are present on the project sites. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- c-d. According to the City of Lancaster’s General Plan, there are no forests or timberlands located within the City of Lancaster. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the rezoning of forest or timberland and would not cause the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest land. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- e. See responses to Items IIa-d.



|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| III. <u>AIR QUALITY</u> . Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project: |                                |                                       |                              |           |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?  |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?  |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?   |                                | X                                     |                              |           |
| d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?  |                                |                                       | X                            |           |

- a. Development proposed under the City's General Plan would not create air emissions that exceed the Air Quality Management Plan. The proposed projects are consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Code. Therefore, the proposed projects would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan and no impacts would occur.
- b. The project sites are within the boundary of the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) and therefore, are subject to compliance with the thresholds established by the AVAQMD. These thresholds were provided in the AVAQMD's *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Federal Conformity Guidelines document*, dated August 2016. These thresholds have been summarized below in Table 3.

**Table 3**  
**AVAQMD Air Quality Thresholds**

| <b>Criteria Pollutant</b>               | <b>Annual Threshold (tons)</b> | <b>Daily Threshold (pounds)</b> |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Greenhouse Gases (CO <sub>2</sub> e)    | 100,000                        | 548,000                         |
| Carbon Monoxide (CO)                    | 100                            | 548                             |
| Oxides of Nitrogen (NO <sub>x</sub> )   | 25                             | 137                             |
| Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)        | 25                             | 137                             |
| Oxides of Sulfur (SO <sub>x</sub> )     | 25                             | 137                             |
| Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )  | 15                             | 82                              |
| Particulate Matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> ) | 12                             | 65                              |
| Hydrogen Sulfide (H <sub>2</sub> S)     | 10                             | 54                              |
| Lead (Pb)                               | 0.6                            | 3                               |

The proposed projects are not large enough to require the preparation of an air quality study. Construction of the proposed project would generate air emissions associated with grading, use of heavy equipment, construction worker vehicles, etc. However, the emissions are not anticipated to exceed the established thresholds identified above due to the size and the type of proposed project.

The proposed projects would generate a combined total of 331 new vehicle trips per day according to the City Traffic Engineer. The trip generation is based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual, 10<sup>th</sup> Edition. These trips would generate air emissions; however, due to the small number of daily trips, these emissions would not be sufficient to create or significantly contribute towards violations of the air quality standards. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c. The closest sensitive receptors are the single-family residences located immediately south of the project sites along Avenue J between 60<sup>th</sup> Street West and 65<sup>th</sup> Street West. The trips associated with the proposed projects would generate emissions; however, the amount of traffic generated by the projects is not sufficient to create or contribute considerably to violations of air quality standards on either a localized or regional basis. The proposed projects would not contain significant stationary sources that would contribute to air quality violations. Additionally, it is not anticipated that the air emissions from the construction or the operation of the proposed projects would exceed the thresholds established by the AVAQMD. Therefore, substantial pollutant concentrations would not occur and impacts would be less than significant.

However, since the construction of the proposed projects would result in the disturbance of the soil, it is possible individuals could be exposed to Valley Fever. Valley Fever or coccidioidomycosis, is primarily a disease of the lungs caused by the spores of the *Coccidioides immitis* fungus. The spores are found in soils, become airborne when the soil is disturbed, and are subsequently inhaled into the lungs. After the fungal spores have settled in the lungs, they change into a multicellular structure called a spherule. Fungal growth in the lungs occurs as the spherule grows and bursts, releasing endospores, which then develop into more spherules.

Valley Fever is not contagious, and therefore, cannot be passed on from person to person. Most of those who are infected would recover without treatment within six months and would have a

life-long immunity to the fungal spores. In severe cases, especially in those patients with rapid and extensive primary illness, those who are at risk for dissemination of disease, and those who have disseminated disease, antifungal drug therapy is used.

Nearby sensitive receptors as well as workers at the project site could be exposed to Valley Fever from fugitive dust generated during construction. There is the potential that cocci spores would be stirred up during excavation, grading, and earth-moving activities, exposing construction workers and nearby sensitive receptors to these spores and thereby to the potential of contracting Valley Fever. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure Number 12, under Geology and Soils, which requires the project operator to implement dust control measures in compliance with AVAQMD Rule 403, and implementation of Mitigation Measure Number 1, below, which would provide personal protective respiratory equipment to construction workers and provide information to all construction personnel and visitors about Valley Fever, the risk of exposure to Valley Fever would be minimized to a less than significant level.

### Mitigation Measures

1. Prior to ground disturbance activities, the project operator shall provide evidence to the Development Services Director that the project operator and/or construction manager has developed a "Valley Fever Training Handout", training, and schedule of sessions for education to be provided to all construction personnel. All evidence of the training session materials, handout(s) and schedule shall be submitted to the Development Services Director within 24 hours of the first training session. Multiple training sessions may be conducted if different work crews will come to the site for different stages of construction; however, all construction personnel shall be provided training prior to beginning work. The evidence submitted to the Development Services Director regarding the "Valley Fever Training Handout" and Session(s) shall include the following:
  - A sign-in sheet (to include the printed employee names, signature, and date) for all employees who attended the training session.
  - Distribution of a written flier or brochure that includes educational information regarding the health effects of exposure to criteria pollutant emissions and Valley Fever.
  - Training on methods that may help prevent Valley Fever infection.
  - A demonstration to employees on how to use personal protective equipment, such as respiratory equipment (masks), to reduce exposure to pollutants and facilitate recognition of symptoms and earlier treatment of Valley Fever. Where respirators are required, the equipment shall be readily available and shall be provided to employees for use during work. Proof that the demonstration is included in the training shall be submitted to the county. This proof can be via printed training materials/agenda, DVD, digital media files, or photographs.

The project operator also shall consult with the Los Angeles County Public Health to develop a Valley Fever Dust Management Plan that addresses the potential presence of the *Coccidioides* spore and mitigates for the potential for *Coccidioidomycosis* (Valley Fever). Prior to issuance of permits, the project operator shall submit the Plan to the Los Angeles County Public Health for review and comment. The Plan shall include a program to evaluate the potential for exposure to Valley Fever from construction activities and to identify appropriate safety procedures that shall be implemented, as

needed, to minimize personnel and public exposure to potential *Coccidioides* spores. Measures in the Plan shall include the following:

- Provide HEP-filters for heavy equipment equipped with factory enclosed cabs capable of accepting the filters. Cause contractors utilizing applicable heavy equipment to furnish proof of worker training on proper use of applicable heavy equipment cabs, such as turning on air conditioning prior to using the equipment.
- Provide communication methods, such as two-way radios, for use in enclosed cabs.
- Require National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH)-approved half-face respirators equipped with minimum N-95 protection factor for use during worker collocation with surface disturbance activities, as required per the hazard assessment process.
- Cause employees to be medically evaluated, fit-tested, and properly trained on the use of the respirators, and implement a full respiratory protection program in accordance with the applicable Cal/OSHA Respiratory Protection Standard (8 CCR 5144).
- Provide separate, clean eating areas with hand-washing facilities.
- Install equipment inspection stations at each construction equipment access/egress point. Examine construction vehicles and equipment for excess soil material and clean, as necessary, before equipment is moved off-site.
- Train workers to recognize the symptoms of Valley Fever, and to promptly report suspected symptoms of work-related Valley Fever to a supervisor.
- Work with a medical professional to develop a protocol to medically evaluate employees who develop symptoms of Valley Fever.
- Work with a medical professional, in consultation with the Los Angeles County Public Health, to develop an educational handout for on-site workers and surrounding residents within three miles of the project site, and include the following information on Valley Fever: what are the potential sources/ causes, what are the common symptoms, what are the options or remedies available should someone be experiencing these symptoms, and where testing for exposure is available. Prior to construction permit issuance, this handout shall have been created by the project operator and reviewed by the project operator and reviewed by the Development Services Director. No less than 30 days prior to any work commencing, this handout shall be mailed to all existing residences within a specified radius of the project boundaries as determined by the Development Services Director. The radius shall not exceed three miles and is dependent upon the location of the project site.
- When possible, position workers upwind or crosswind when digging a trench or performing other soil-disturbing tasks.
- Prohibit smoking at the worksite outside of designated smoking areas; designated smoking areas will be equipped with handwashing facilities.
- Post warnings on-site and consider limiting access to visitors, especially those without adequate training and respiratory protection.
- Audit and enforce compliance with relevant Cal OSHA health and safety standards on the job site.

- d. Construction of the proposed projects is not anticipated to produce significant objectionable odors. Construction equipment may generate some odors, but these odors would be similar to those produced by vehicles traveling Avenue J, 60<sup>th</sup> Street West and 65<sup>th</sup> Street West. Most objectionable odors are typically associated with industrial projects involving the use of chemicals, solvents, petroleum products and other strong smelling elements used in manufacturing processes, as well as sewage treatment facilities and landfills. These types of uses are not part of the proposed projects. Odors may also be generated by typical residential activities (e.g., cooking, etc.). However, these odors are considered to be less than significant. Therefore, impacts associated with odors would be less than significant.



|  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant<br>With<br>Mitigation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| IV. <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</u> Would the project:  |                                      |  |                                    |              |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? |                                      | X  |                                    |              |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?  |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?   |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?   |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?   |                                      |  |                                    | X            |

- a. Two biological resource surveys were originally conducted for the project sites by Circle Mountain Biological Consultants, Inc. and documented in separate reports: "Focused Survey for Agassiz's Desert Tortoise, Habitat Assessments for Burrowing Owl and Mohave Ground Squirrel, and General Biological Resources Assessment for a 6.5-acre± Site (APN 3203-008-045) in the City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California" and "Focused Survey for Agassiz's Desert Tortoise, Habitat Assessments for Burrowing Owl and Mohave Ground Squirrel, and General Biological Resources Assessment for a 3.25-acre± Site (APN 3203-008-046) in the City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California". Both of these reports are dated February 2014. An updated survey was conducted by Circle Mountain Biological Consultants for

both sites and documented in a report titled "Reevaluation of biological resources on two parcels (APNs 3203-008-045 & -046) in the City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, CA" and dated January 30, 2019.

Pedestrian surveys were conducted on both project sites on January 26, 2014 with a resurvey occurring on January 26, 2019. These surveys were in accordance with existing desert tortoise and burrowing owl protocols. Table 4 provides a listing of all of the plant species observed on each of the project sites and Table 5 provides a list of all of the animal species observed on the project sites. An "\*" indicates that the species was only identified in 2019. A "+" indicates that the species was not observed on the project site but was observed on the adjacent property. No desert tortoise or Mohave ground squirrels or their sign were observed on the project sites and are not expected to occur.

The following summarizes the individual results for each of the project sites.

**Site 1:** This site is located at the northeast corner of 65<sup>th</sup> Street West and Newgrove Street and is characteristic of highly degraded saltbush scrub. Portions of the site contain an elevated berm and soil piles. During the 2014 survey, a total of 33 plant species (20 onsite and 13 offsite) and 22 animal species were identified.

The project site does not contain suitable habitat for either desert tortoise or Mohave ground squirrel and no evidence of either species was observed during either the 2014 or 2019 surveys. During the 2014 survey, no evidence of burrowing owls were observed on the project site; although whitewash and older burrowing owl pellets were identified to the east of the project site and to the west of the northwest corner of the project site. Additionally, no other sensitive plant or animal species, including alkali mariposa lilies, were observed on the project site during the 2014 survey.

During the 2019 survey, a total of 27 plant species and 16 animal species were observed on the project site. Additionally, alkali mariposa lilies were observed in seven locations including one location at the northwest corner of the project site. Both burrowing owl and loggerhead shrike were observed on the project site.

A burrowing owl was residing beneath the dumped construction rubble and the amount of pellets and whitewash indicate that one or more burrowing owls have been residing in this location for some time. Additional burrowing owl signs were observed at three old dog digs on adjacent properties. A loggerhead shrike was also observed near the center of the project site.

**Site 2:** This site is located at the northwest corner of 62<sup>nd</sup> Street West and Newgrove Street and is characteristic of a relatively intact saltbush scrub. The southwest corner of the project site has been impacted by some residential pads on the neighboring property. Additionally, some small playa areas are present on the project site. During the 2014 survey, a total of 33 plant species (21 onsite and 12 offsite) and 22 animal species were identified.

**Table 4**  
**Observed Plant Species**

| <b>Site 1</b>  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Annual bursage ( <i>Ambrosia acanthicarpa</i> )            | Burrobush ( <i>Ambrosia dumosa</i> )                      | Cheesebush ( <i>Ambrosia [Hymenoclea] salsola</i> )   |
| Great Basin sagebrush ( <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> )      | Star thistle ( <i>Centaurea melitensis</i> )              | Rubber rabbitbrush ( <i>Chrysothamnus nauseosus</i> ) |
| Desert milk aster ( <i>Stephanomeria pauciflora</i> )      | Saharan mustard ( <i>Brassica tournefortii</i> )          | Bush peppergrass ( <i>Lepidium fremontii</i> )        |
| Tumble mustard ( <i>Sisymbrium altissimum</i> )            | Four-winged saltbush ( <i>Atriplex canescens</i> )        | Spiny saltbush ( <i>Atriplex confertifolia</i> )      |
| Spiny saltbush ( <i>Atriplex spinifera</i> )               | Russian thistle ( <i>Salsola tragus</i> )                 | Doveweed ( <i>eremocarpus setigerus</i> )             |
| Red-stemmed filaree ( <i>Erodium cicutarium</i> )          | Buckwheat ( <i>Eriogonum viridescens</i> )                | Peach thorn ( <i>Lycium cooperi</i> )                 |
| Red brome ( <i>Bromus madritensis</i> ssp. <i>rubens</i> ) | Cheat grass ( <i>Bromus tectorum</i> )                    | Salt grass ( <i>Distichlis spicata</i> )              |
| Hare barley ( <i>Hordeum murinum</i> )                     | Split-grass ( <i>Schismus</i> sp.)                        | Alkali dropseed ( <i>Sporobolus airoides</i> )        |
| California juniper ( <i>Juniperus californica</i> ) +      | Nevada joint-fir ( <i>Ephedra nevadensis</i> ) +          | Dicoria ( <i>Dicoria canescens</i> ) +                |
| Sunflower ( <i>Helianthus gracilentus</i> ) +              | Desert heliotrope ( <i>Heliotropium curvassivicum</i> ) + | Torrey's sea-blight ( <i>Suaeda moquinii</i> ) +      |
| Sandmat ( <i>Chamaesyce [Euphorbia] polycarpa</i> ) +      | Croton ( <i>Croton californicus</i> ) +                   | Blue dicks ( <i>Dichelostemma pulchellum</i> ) +      |
| Alkali mariposa lily ( <i>Calochortus striatus</i> ) *     |   |   |
| <b>Site 2</b>  |   |   |
| Cheesebush   | Great Basin sagebrush                                     | Star thistle  |
| Rubber rabbitbrush   | Desert milk aster   | Saharan mustard                                       |
| Bush peppergrass   | Tumble mustard  | Spiny saltbush  |
| Four-winged saltbush                                       | Spiny saltbush  | Russian thistle                                       |
| Doveweed   | Red-stemmed filaree                                       | Buckwheat   |
| Peach thorn  | Red brome   | Cheat grass   |
| Salt grass   | Split-grass   | Alkali dropseed                                       |
| California juniper +                                       | Nevada joint-fir +  | Dicoria +   |
| Annual bursage +   | Burrobush +   | Sunflower +   |
| Desert heliotrope +  | Torrey's sea-blight +                                     | Red-stemmed filaree +                                 |
| Sandmat +  | Croton +  | Blue dicks +  |
| Hare barley +  |   |   |

**Table 5**  
**Observed Animal Species**

| <b>Site 1</b>   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Mourning dove ( <i>Zenaida macroura</i> )                 | Horned lark ( <i>Eremophila alpestris</i> )          | Common raven ( <i>Corvus corax</i> )                     |
| Black-tailed hare ( <i>Lepus californicus</i> )           | Audubon cottontail ( <i>Sylvilagus audubonii</i> )   | Kangaroo rat ( <i>dipodomys</i> sp.)                     |
| Coyote ( <i>Canis latrans</i> )                           | Bobcat ( <i>Lynx rufus</i> )                         | Turkey vulture ( <i>Cathartes aura</i> ) +               |
| White-tailed kite ( <i>Elanus caeruleus</i> ) +           | American kestrel ( <i>Falco sparverius</i> ) +       | Herring gull ( <i>Larus argentatus</i> ) +               |
| Rock dove ( <i>Columba livia</i> ) +                      | Common barn owl ( <i>Tyto alba</i> ) +               | Great horned owl ( <i>Bubo virginianus</i> ) +           |
| Burrowing owl ( <i>Athene cunicularia</i> ) *             | Lesser nighthawk ( <i>Chordeiles acutipennis</i> ) + | Black-throated sparrow ( <i>Amphispiza bilineata</i> ) + |
| White-crowned sparrow ( <i>Zonotrichia leucophrys</i> ) + | Western meadowlark ( <i>Sturnella neglecta</i> ) +   | House finch ( <i>Carpodacus mexicanus</i> ) +            |
| Botta pocket gopher ( <i>Thomomys bottae</i> ) +          |  |  |
| <b>Site 2</b>   |  |  |
| Turkey vulture  | Herring gull   | Common barn owl  |
| Great horned owl  | Burrowing owl  | Horned lark ( <i>Eremophila alpestris</i> )              |
| Common raven  | Western meadowlark                                   | Black-tailed hare  |
| Audubon cottontail  | Botta pocket gopher                                  | Kangaroo rat   |
| Coyote  | Bobcat   | White-tailed kite +                                      |
| American kestrel +  | Rock dove +  | Mourning dove +  |
| Lesser nighthawk +  | Black-throated sparrow +                             | White-crowned sparrow +                                  |
| House finch +   |  |  |

The project site does not contain suitable habitat for either desert tortoise or Mohave ground squirrel and no evidence of either species was observed during either the 2014 or 2019 surveys. During the 2014 survey, a burrowing owl pellet was found on the project site near the western boundary; however, no suitable burrow locations were found on the project site. The closest potential burrow (whitewash and 3 older pellets) is approximately 440 feet north at an inactive domestic dog dig. Additionally, no other sensitive plant or animal species, including alkali mariposa lilies, were observed on the project site during the 2014 survey.

During the 2019 survey, a total of 27 plant species and 16 animal species were observed on the project site. No sensitive plants or animals, or signs thereof were observed on the project site during the survey.

## Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure apply to both projects:

2. A nesting bird survey shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities. If nesting birds are encountered, all work in the area shall cease until either the young birds have fledged or the appropriate permits are obtained from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. If Swainson's hawks are identified using the project site during the survey, the applicant shall contact the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to determine the appropriate mitigation/management requirements. No construction shall occur within 0.5 miles of an active Swainson's hawk nest or within 500 feet of active nests for other raptors.
3. Burrowing owl(s) have been determined to be either present on the project site or in the immediately surrounding area during both the 2014 and 2019 surveys. Burrowing owl protocol surveys shall be conducted on the project sites prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities in accordance with established burrowing owl protocols. A qualified biological shall conduct these surveys in accordance with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) requirements. If burrowing owls are found to be utilizing a site at the time of the protocol surveys, the developer shall coordinate appropriate mitigation/minimization measures with CDFW. These could include, but are not limited to, buffer zones, excluding burrowing owls from the nest, and replacement habitat.

The following mitigation measures shall apply to Site 1 only:

4. Alkali mariposa lilies were determined to be present on the project site during course of 2019 survey. The applicant shall pay \$2,405 per acre to mitigate for the loss of alkali mariposa lily habitat, for a total of \$15,635.50. Payment of this fee shall occur prior to the issuance of any construction related permits (e.g., grading, building, etc.).

The following mitigation measures apply to Site 2 only:

5. The applicant shall conduct a springtime plant survey to determine the presence or absence of alkali mariposa lily. The applicant shall pay \$2,405 per acre for those portions of the project site determined to contain alkali mariposa lilies. In the event that a springtime survey cannot be conducted prior to the start of construction activities, the applicant shall have the biologist determine the most likely areas for lilies to be present and the fee shall apply to those areas.
- b. The project sites do not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Therefore, no impact would occur.
  - c. There are no State or federally protected wetlands on the project sites as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
  - d. The project sites are not part of an established migratory wildlife corridor. Therefore, no impacts would occur.



- e. The proposed projects would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances, such as a tree preservation policy, protecting biological resources. The proposed projects would be subject to the requirements of Ordinance No. 848, Biological Impact Fee, which requires the payment of \$770/acre to offset the cumulative loss of biological resources in the Antelope Valley as a result of development. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- f. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans which are applicable to the project sites. The West Mojave Coordinated Habitat Conservation Plan only applies to Bureau of Land Management properties and as such does not apply to the proposed projects. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| V. <u>CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> . Would the project:  |                                |                                       |                              |           |
| a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?       |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resources pursuant to §15064.5? |                                | X                                     |                              |           |
| c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?                        |                                |                                       |                              | X         |

- a-c. A cultural resources survey was conducted for the project sites by RT Factfinders and the results documented in a report entitled "Phase I Cultural Resource Investigation for Approximately 6.5 acres Northeast of the Intersection of 65<sup>th</sup> Street West and Newgrove Street Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California" dated January 2019. The report includes a records search, sacred lands file search and a field survey. There are no previously recorded cultural resources on the subject properties and the sacred lands file search produced negative results. On January 2, 2019, a field survey was conducted by walking pedestrian transects spaced 15 meters apart. No cultural resources were identified. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

No human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, were discovered on the project site nor are they expected to occur.

While no Native American/prehistoric cultural resources were identified on the project sites, it is possible that unknown resources may be encountered during the course of construction related activities. Additionally, during the course of consultation with two Native American tribes, specific mitigation measures were requested. These measures have been identified below. With the incorporation of these measures, impacts would be less than significant.

#### Mitigation Measures

6. The project applicant/developer shall retain a Tribal Cultural Resource monitor procured by the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians to observe all clearing, grubbing, and grading operations within the project site. If cultural resources are encountered, the Tribal Cultural Resources monitor shall have the authority to request ground disturbing activities cease within 60 feet of the discovery to assess and document potential finds in real time. The Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians shall be contacted to consult if any such find occurs.
7. In the event that cultural resources are discovered during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) shall cease and a qualified archaeologist meeting the Secretary of Interior standards shall be hired to assess the find.

Work on the other portions of the project outside of the buffered area may continue during this assessment period. Additionally, the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department shall be contacted regarding any pre-contact finds and provided information after the archaeologist makes their initial assessment of the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment.

8. If significant pre-contact cultural resources, as defined by CEQA, are discovered and avoidance cannot be ensured, the archaeologist shall develop a Monitoring and Treatment Plan, the drafts of which shall be provided to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians for review and comment. The archaeologist shall monitor the remainder of the project and implement the Plan accordingly.
9. If human remains or funerary objects are encountered during any activities associated with the project, work in the immediate vicinity (within a 100-foot buffer of the find) shall cease and the County Coroner shall be contacted pursuant to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and that code shall be enforced for the duration of the project.
10. The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department shall be contacted in the event any pre-contact cultural resources are discovered during project implementation and be provided information regarding the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment. Should the find be deemed significant, as defined by CEQA, a cultural resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan shall be created by the archaeologist, in coordination with the tribe, and all subsequent finds shall be subject to this plan. This plan shall allow for a monitor to be present that represents the tribe for the remainder of the project, should the tribe elect to place a monitor on-site.
11. Any and all archaeological/cultural documents created as a part of the project (isolate records, site records, survey reports, testing reports, etc.) shall be supplied to the applicant and Lead Agency for dissemination to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians. The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with the listed tribes throughout the life of the project.

|   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant<br>With<br>Mitigation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| VI. <u>ENERGY</u> . Would the project:  |                                      |  |                                    |              |
| a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficient?  |                                      |  |                                    | X            |

- a. Project construction would consume energy in two general forms: 1) the fuel energy consumed by construction vehicles and equipment and 2) bound energy in construction materials, such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes, and manufactured or processed materials such as lumber and glass. Fossil fuels used for construction vehicles and other energy-consuming equipment would be used during site clearing, grading, and construction. Fuel energy consumed during construction would be temporary and would not represent a significant demand on energy resources. In addition, some incidental energy conservation would occur during construction through compliance with State requirements that equipment not in use for more than five minutes be turned off. Project construction equipment would also be required to comply with the latest EPA and CARB engine emissions standards. These emissions standards require highly efficient combustion systems that maximize fuel efficiency and reduce unnecessary fuel consumption.

Substantial reductions in energy inputs for construction materials can be achieved by selecting building materials composed of recycled materials that require substantially less energy to produce than non-recycled materials. The project-related incremental increase in the use of energy bound in construction materials such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes and manufactured or processed materials (e.g., lumber and gas) would not substantially increase demand for energy compared to overall local and regional demand for construction materials.

The proposed projects would consume energy for interior and exterior lighting, heating/ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC), refrigeration, electronics systems, appliances, and security systems, among other things. The proposed project would be required to comply with Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, which provide minimum efficiency standards related to various building features, including appliances, water and space heating and cooling equipment, building insulation and roofing, and lighting. Implementation of the Title 24 standards significantly reduces energy usage. Furthermore, the electricity provider is subject to California's Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS). The RPS requires investor owned utilities, electric service providers, and community choice aggregators (CCA) to increase procurement from eligible renewable energy resources to 33 percent of total procurement by 2020 and to 50 percent of total procurement by 2030. Renewable energy is generally defined as energy that comes from resources, which are naturally replenished within a human timescale such as sunlight, wind, tides, waves, and geothermal heat.

The proposed projects would adhere to all Federal, State, and local requirements for energy efficiency, including the Title 24 standards, as well as the project's design features and as such the project would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of building energy.

- b. In 1978, the California Energy Commission (CEC) established Title 24, California's energy efficiency standards for residential and non-residential buildings, in response to a legislative mandate to create uniform building codes to reduce California's energy consumption, and provide energy efficiency standards for residential and non-residential buildings. The 2016 standards went into effect on January 1, 2017 and substantially reduce electricity and natural gas consumption. Additional savings result from the application of the standards on building alterations such as cool roofs, lighting, and air distribution ducts.

The California Green Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11), commonly referred to as the CALGreen Code, is a statewide mandatory construction code that was developed and adopted by the California Building Standards Commission and the California Department of Housing and Community Development. CALGreen standards require new residential and commercial buildings to comply with mandatory measures under five topical areas: planning and design; energy efficiency; water efficiency and conservation; material conservation and resource efficiency; and environmental quality. The most recent update to the CALGreen Code went into effect on January 1, 2020.

In 2014, Lancaster created Lancaster Choice Energy (LCE), allowing residents and businesses in Lancaster to choose the source of their electricity, including an opportunity to opt up to 100% renewable energy. SCE continues to deliver the electricity and provide billing, customer service and powerline maintenance and repair, while customers who choose to participate in this program would receive power from renewable electric generating private-sector partners at affordable rates.

The houses constructed as a result of the proposed projects would comply with all of these regulations and would not conflict or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.



|  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant<br>With<br>Mitigation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| VII. <u>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</u> . Would the project:   |                                      |  |                                    |              |
| a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:   |                                      |  |                                    |              |
| i) 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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?   |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?   |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| iv) Landslides?  |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?  |                                      | X  |                                    |              |
| 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, liquefaction or collapse?   |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?  |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?   |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?  |                                      |  |                                    | X            |

- a. The project sites are not identified as being in or in proximity to a fault rupture zone (LMEA Figure 2-5). According to the Seismic Hazard Evaluation of the Lancaster East and West Quadrangles, the project sites may be subject to intense seismic shaking (LMEA pg. 2-16). However, the proposed project would be constructed in accordance with the seismic requirements of the Uniform Building Code (UBC) adopted by the City, which would render any

potential impacts to a less than significant level. The sites are generally level and are not subject to landslides (SSHZ).

Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which the strength and stiffness of a soil is reduced by earthquake shaking or other events. This phenomenon occurs in saturated soils that undergo intense seismic shaking typically associated with an earthquake. There are three specific conditions that need to be in place for liquefaction to occur: loose granular soils, shallow groundwater (usually less than 50 feet below ground surface) and intense seismic shaking. In February 2005, the California Geologic Survey updated the Seismic Hazard Zones Map for Lancaster (SSHZ). Based on these maps, the project sites are not located in an area at risk for liquefaction. No impacts would occur

- b. The project sites are rated as having a moderate risk for soil erosion (USDA SCS Maps) when cultivated or cleared of vegetation. As such, there remains a potential for water and wind erosion during construction. The proposed projects would be required, under the provisions of the Lancaster Municipal Code (LMC) Chapter 8.16, to adequately wet or seal the soil to prevent wind erosion. Additionally, the following mitigation measure shall be required to control dust/wind erosion.

Water erosion controls must be provided as part of the proposed projects' grading plans to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineering Division. These provisions, which are a part of the proposed projects, would reduce any impacts to less than significant levels.

#### Mitigation Measures

- 12. The applicant shall submit a Dust Control Plan to the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) for review and approval in accordance with Rule 403, Fugitive Dust, prior to the issuance of any grading and/or construction permits. This plan shall demonstrate adequate water or dust suppressant application equipment to mitigate all disturbed areas.
- c. Subsidence is the sinking of the soil caused by the extraction of water, petroleum, etc. Subsidence can result in geologic hazards known as fissures. Fissures are typically associated with faults or groundwater withdrawal, which results in the cracking of the ground surface. According to Figure 2-3 of the City of Lancaster's Master Environmental Assessment, the closest sinkholes and fissures to the project sites are located on the north side of Avenue I at approximately 40<sup>th</sup> Street West, approximately two miles to the northeast. The project sites are not known to be within an area subject to fissuring, sinkholes, or subsidence or any other form of geologic unit or soil instability. For a discussion of potential impacts regarding liquefaction, please refer to Section Item VII.a. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- d. The soil on the project sites is characterized by a low shrink/swell potential (LMEA Figure 2-3). A soils report for the proposed projects shall be submitted to the City by the project developer prior to grading and the recommendations of the report shall be incorporated into the development of the proposed projects. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- e. The proposed projects would be tied into the sanitary sewer system. No septic or alternative means of waste water disposal are part of the proposed projects. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

- f. There are no known unique paleontological resources, sites, or unique geologic features located on the project sites. Therefore, no impact would occur.

|   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant<br>With<br>Mitigation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| VIII. <u>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</u> Would the project:   |                                      |  |                                    |              |
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?       |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? |                                      |  | X                                  |              |

- a-b. The proposed projects involve subdividing the subject properties into a combined total of 34 individual lots for single family residences. As discussed in Section Item III.b., the proposed projects would generate air emissions during construction and operational activities, some of which may be greenhouse gases. These emissions are anticipated to be less than the thresholds established by AVAQMD due to the size of the projects and therefore, would not prevent the State from reaching its greenhouse gas reduction targets. Once the developments are operational, they would generate emissions, primarily from vehicles and other activities associated with the residential uses, including yard maintenance, heating/cooling maintenance, etc. However, the developments would be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code, including the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance, the California Green Building Code and other requirements which increase the efficiency of the buildings and reduce air emissions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed projects would also be in compliance with the greenhouse gas goals and policies identified in the City of Lancaster General Plan (LMEA p.7-2 to 7-15) and in the City's adopted Climate Action Plan. Therefore, impacts with respect to conflicts with an agency's plans, policies, and regulations would be less than significant.

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| IX. <u>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</u> Would the project:  |                                |                                       |                              |           |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| 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         |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?  |                                | X                                     |                              |           |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?   |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |

- a-b. The proposed projects consist of subdividing the subject properties into a combined total of 34 individual lots for single family residences. Typical construction materials would be utilized during development of the subdivisions. Occupants of the subdivisions would typically utilize household cleaners (e.g., cleanser, bleach, etc.), fertilizer, and potentially limited use of common pesticides. These uses would be similar to other residential development in the area. The proposed projects are not located along a hazardous materials transportation corridor (LMEA p. 9.1-14 and Figure 9.1-4). Development of the project sites would not involve the demolition of

any structures and therefore, would not expose individuals or the environment to asbestos containing materials or lead based paint. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c. The project sites are not located within a quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The closest school to the project sites is Sundown Elementary School, located approximately 1 mile south of the project sites at 6151 West Avenue J-8. Additionally, the proposed projects would not emit hazardous emissions and use/disposal of any hazardous materials typically found in residential settings would occur in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- d. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for the proposed projects by Priority One Environmental. The findings of the study are documented in "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for Two Vacant Parcels, Lancaster, CA, APN: 3203-008-045 & 3203-008-046" dated January 9, 2019.

A site visit was conducted on both parcels on January 4, 2019. The western parcel (Site 1) appears to have been partially graded in the past and contains several piles of dumped dirt. The eastern parcel (Site 2) is in its native, undeveloped state. No evidence of surface staining, odors, stressed vegetation or spills was identified on either site. However, the dumped soil piles are considered a recognized environmental condition due to the unknown origin and require further investigation. A mitigation measure has been identified below for Site 1 to ensure that any impacts associated with the dirt piles are less than significant.

In addition to the site visit, a regulatory records review was conducted for the project sites and surrounding area by EDR. The project sites were not listed in any regulatory database. However, three Leaking Underground Storage Tanks were identified within a ½ mile of the project sites. Information regarding these sites can be found in Table 6, below. Based on the information provided in the report, these sites would not create an impact for the project sites and the proposed developments. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

**Table 6**  
**Regulatory Database Search Results**

| Site Name                                    | Address                     | Distance      | Databases | Status         |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------|-----------|----------------|
| LA County Health Service – High Desert       | 44900 60 <sup>th</sup> St W | .34 miles NE  | LUST      | Closed 9/1/16  |
| Kaufman & Board of So Cal Inc.               | 6000 Avenue J               | .356 miles SE | LUST      | Closed 3/31/93 |
| Los Angeles County High Desert Solar Project | 45100 60 <sup>th</sup> St W | .383 miles NE | LUST      | Closed 9/9/03  |

#### Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure is required for Site 1 to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. With implementation of the mitigation measure and all recommendations, impacts would be less than significant.

13. The applicant shall have Phase II sampling conducted on the dirt piles present on Site 1 (TTM 82830) and comply with all identified recommendations prior to the issuance of any construction related permits (e.g., grubbing, grading, building, etc.).
- e. The proposed projects are not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport, public use airport, or private airstrip. The nearest airfield, General William Fox Airfield, is located approximately 2.5 miles northeast of the project sites. Therefore, no safety or noise impacts would occur from airport operations as a result of people working or residing in the area.
- f. The traffic generated by the proposed projects is not expected to block the roadways and improvements that have been conditioned as part of the projects would ensure that traffic operates smoothly. Therefore, the proposed projects would not impair or physically block any identified evacuation routes and would not interfere with any adopted emergency response plan. Impacts would not occur.
- g. The surrounding properties are vacant and currently under construction directly to the south. It is possible that these lands could be subject to a grass fire. The project sites are located within 2.5 miles of Los Angeles County Fire Station No. 130, located at 44558 40<sup>th</sup> Street West which would serve the project sites in the event of a fire. Therefore, potential impacts from wildland fires would be less than significant.

|  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant<br>With<br>Mitigation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| X. <u>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</u> Would the project:  |                                      |  |                                    |              |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?   |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?                                  |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: |                                      |  |                                    |              |
| i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site  |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site   |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff                                 |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| iv) Impede or redirect flood flows   |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?  |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?  |                                      |  |                                    | X            |

- a. The project sites are not located in an area with an open body of water or in aquifer recharge area. The proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable provisions of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. The NPDES program establishes a comprehensive storm water quality program to manage urban storm water and minimize pollution of the environment to the maximum extent practicable. The reduction of pollutants in urban storm water discharge through the use of structural and nonstructural Best Management



Practices (BMPs) is one of the primary objectives of the water quality regulations. BMPs that are typically used to management runoff water quality include controlling roadway and parking lot contaminants by installing oil and grease separators at storm drain inlets, cleaning parking lots on a regular basis, incorporating peak-flow reduction and infiltration features (grass swales, infiltration trenches and grass filter strips) into landscaping and implementing educational programs. The proposed projects would incorporate appropriate BMPs during construction, as determined by the City of Lancaster Development Services Department. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed projects consist of a combined total of 34 single-family residences lots. Single family residences are not a use that would normally generate wastewater that violates water quality standards or exceeds waste discharge requirements. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- b. The proposed projects would not include any groundwater wells or pumping activities. All water supplied to the proposed projects would be obtained from the Los Angeles County Water District No. 40 (LACWD). Additionally, as indicated in X.a, the proposed projects would not impact any groundwater recharge areas. Therefore, the proposed projects would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge and impacts would be less than significant.
- c. Development of the proposed projects would increase the amount of surface runoff as a result of impervious surfaces associated with the roadways and residences. The proposed project would be designed, on the basis of a hydrology study, to accept current flows entering the properties and to handle the additional incremental runoff from the developed sites. Therefore, impacts from drainage and runoff would be less than significant.
- d. The project sites are not located within a coastal zone. Therefore, tsunamis are not a potential hazard. The project sites are relatively flat and do not contain any enclosed bodies of water and are not located in close proximity to any other large bodies of water. Therefore, the proposed projects would not be subject to inundation by seiches or mudflows. No impacts would occur.

The project sites are designated as Flood Zone X-Shaded per the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Panel No. 060672 (2008) (06037C0405F). Flood Zone X-Shaded is located outside of both the 100-year flood zone but within the 500-year flood zone. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

- e. The proposed projects is residential in nature. As such, the proposed projects would not conflict or obstruct the implementation of the applicable water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. For additional information see responses X.a through X.c. Impacts would be less than significant.

|  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant<br>With<br>Mitigation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| XI. <u>LAND USE AND PLANNING.</u> Would the project:   |                                      |  |                                    |              |
| a) Physically divide an established community?   |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? |                                      |  |                                    | X            |

- a. The proposed projects consist of subdividing the subject sites into a combined total of 34 individual lots for single family residences. The proposed projects would not block a public street, trail or other access route or result in a physical barrier that would divide the community. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- b. The proposed projects are consistent with the City's General Plan and must be in conformance with the Lancaster Municipal Code. The proposed projects will be in compliance with the City-adopted Uniform Building Code (UBC) and erosion control requirements (Section VII). Additionally, as noted Section IV, the project sites are not subject to and would not conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

|   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant<br>With<br>Mitigation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| XII. <u>MINERAL RESOURCES</u> . Would the project:  |                                      |  |                                    |              |
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?                                |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? |                                      |  |                                    | X            |

- a-b. The project sites do not contain any mining or recovery operations for mineral resources and no such activities have occurred on the project sites in the past. According to the LMEA (Figure 2-4 and page 2-8), the project sites is not designated as Mineral Reserve 3 (contains potential but presently unproven resources). Additionally, it is not considered likely that the Lancaster area has large, valuable mineral and aggregate deposits. Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources would occur.

|   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant<br>With<br>Mitigation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| XIII. <u>NOISE</u> . Would the project:   |                                      |  |                                    |              |
| a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?   |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?   |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (e) |                                      |  |                                    | X            |

- a. The City's General Plan (Table 3-1) establishes an outdoor maximum CNEL of 65 dBA for residential uses. Table 8-11 of the LMEA provides existing roadway noise levels adjacent to the project sites. The current noise level in the vicinity of the project sites is as follows: Avenue J between 70th Street West and 60th Street West is 60.8. This noise level is consistent with the standards of the General Plan. While this noise level is consistent with the standards of the General Plan additional features of the proposed projects (e.g., landscaping, block walls, etc.) would ensure that the projects remain in compliance with the General Plan. Therefore, potential noise impacts associated with traffic would be less than significant.

Construction activities associated with earth-moving equipment and other construction machinery would temporarily increase noise levels for adjacent land uses. The residences in the area may experience increased noise levels. However, the noise associated with construction activities would occur during daylight hours and in compliance with the City's existing noise ordinance. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed residences would contribute to an increase in noise levels from vehicle traffic and sounds typically associated with residential developments including people talking, children playing, car alarms, music etc. However, these activities and noise levels are consistent with the General Plan, zoning designation, and surrounding land uses. The minimal increase in noise from the proposed projects is not enough to violate established thresholds and would be less than significant.

- b. It is not anticipated that construction of the proposed projects would require the use of machinery that generates ground-borne vibration as no major subsurface construction (e.g., parking garage) is planned. No ground mounted industrial-type equipment that generates ground vibration would be utilized once the projects are constructed and operational. Therefore, no impacts associated with ground-borne vibration/noise are anticipated.
- c. The project sites are not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport, public use airport, or private airstrip. The closest airport is the General William Fox Airfield which is located approximately 2.5 miles to the northeast. Therefore, no noise impacts would occur from airport operations as a result of people working or residing in the area.

|   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant<br>With<br>Mitigation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| <b>XIV. <u>POPULATION AND HOUSING.</u> Would the project:</b>   |                                      |  |                                    |              |
| a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?   |                                      |  |                                    | X            |

- a. The proposed projects may result in an incremental increase in population growth; however, this increase was anticipated in both the City's General Plan and in SCAG's most recent RTP. Additionally, while it is likely that individuals involved in the construction of the proposed projects and working or residing at the proposed projects would come from the Antelope Valley any increase in population would contribute, on an incremental basis, to the population of the City. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The project sites are currently vacant. No housing or people would be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

|   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant<br>With<br>Mitigation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| XV. <u>PUBLIC SERVICES.</u>   |                                      |  |                                    |              |
| a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: |                                      |  |                                    |              |
| Fire Protection?  |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| Police Protection?  |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| Schools?  |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| Parks?  |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| Other Public Facilities?  |                                      |  | X                                  |              |

- a. The proposed projects would increase the need for fire and police services during construction and operation; however, the project sites are within the current service area of both these agencies and the additional time and cost to service the sites is minimal. The proposed projects would not induce substantial population growth and therefore, would not substantially increase the demand on parks, schools or other public facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Construction of the proposed projects may result in an incremental increase in population and may increase the number of students in the Antelope Valley Union High School District or the Westside School District. Proposition 1A, which governs the way in which school funding is carried out, predetermines by statute that payment of developer fees is adequate mitigation for school impacts. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

|  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant<br>With<br>Mitigation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| XVI. <u>RECREATION</u> . Would the project:  |                                      |  |                                    |              |
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?                        |                                      |  | X                                  |              |

- a-b. The proposed projects would generate additional population growth and would contribute on an incremental basis to the use of the existing park and recreational facilities. However, the applicant would be required to pay park fees which would offset the impacts to the existing parks. No new parks would be required or are included as part of the proposed projects. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.



|  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant<br>With<br>Mitigation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| <b>XVII. <u>TRANSPORTATION.</u> Would the project:</b>   |                                      |  |                                    |              |
| a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?         |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?  |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| d) Result in inadequate emergency access?  |                                      |  |                                    | X            |

- a. The proposed projects do not conflict with or impede any of the General Plan policies or specific actions related to alternative modes of transportation (e.g., transit, roadway, bicycle, or pedestrian) (Lancaster General Plan pgs. 5-18 to 5-24). Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- b. The proposed projects would generate a combined total of 331 new vehicle trips per day according to the City Traffic Engineer. This estimate was based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual, 10<sup>th</sup> Edition rate for single family residences. The traffic generated is not anticipated to adversely affect traffic flow on any of the adjoining public streets due to the low trip generation. In addition, the proposed project is located in a developing area and is within close proximity to destinations such as shopping centers, restaurants, offices, schools, and municipal service/government buildings. Due to the low trip generation and proximity to destinations, there would be low vehicles miles traveled and impacts would be less than significant.
- c. Street improvements are required as part of the conditions of approval and would ensure that traffic flows smoothly in the vicinity of the project sites. No hazardous conditions would be created by these improvements. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- d. The project sites would have adequate emergency access from 65<sup>th</sup> Street West. Interior access would be provided in accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles County Fire Department. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

|   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant<br>With<br>Mitigation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| XVIII. <u>TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> . Would the project:  |                                      |  |                                    |              |
| a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:                    |                                      |  |                                    |              |
| i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or  |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set for in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. |                                      |  |                                    | X            |

- a. No specific tribal cultural resources have been identified either through the sacred lands file search conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission or by any of the Native American Tribes with cultural affiliations to the area. Consultations under Assembly Bill 52 were conducted with two tribes: San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians. However, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the cultural resources section to address concerns associated with the discovery of currently unknown resources. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> Would the project:  |                                |                                       |                              |           |
| a) Require or result in the relocation or construction or new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?  |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?  |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impact the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?  |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |

- a. The proposed projects would be required to connect into the existing utilities such as electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, telecommunications, etc. These services already exist in the general area. Connections would occur on the project sites or within existing roadways or right-of-ways. Connections to these utilities are assumed as part of the proposed projects and impacts to environmental resources have been discussed throughout the document. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The proposed projects are not located within the boundaries of the Los Angeles County Waterworks District. However, the Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 has not indicated any problems in supplying water to the proposed projects from existing facilities upon annexation. No new construction of water treatment or new or expanded entitlements would be required. Therefore, water impacts would be less than significant.
- c. The project sites are located outside of the jurisdictional boundaries of the Sanitation District and would be required to annex into the District for service. Upon annexation, wastewater would be treated at the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plan. As the proposed are residential developments,

they would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements and impacts would be less than significant.

- d-e. Solid waste generated within the City limits is generally disposed of at the Lancaster Landfill located at 600 East Avenue F. This landfill is a Class III landfill which accepts agricultural, non-friable asbestos, construction/demolition waste, contaminated soil, green materials, industrial, inert, mixed municipal, sludge, and waste tires. It does not accept hazardous materials. Assembly Bill (AB) 939 was adopted in 1989 and required a 25% diversion of solid waste from landfills by 1995 and a 50% diversion by 2005. In 2011, AB 341 was passed which requires the State to achieve a 75% reduction in solid waste by 2020. The City of Lancaster also requires all developments to have trash collection services in accordance with City contracts with waste haulers over the life of the proposed project. These collection services would also collect recyclable materials. The trash haulers are required to be in compliance with applicable regulations on solid waste transport and disposal, including waste stream reduction mandated under AB 341.

The proposed projects would generate solid waste during construction which would contribute to an overall impact on landfill service (GPEIR pgs. 5.9-20 to 21); although the project's contribution is considered minimal. However, the existing landfill has capacity to handle the waste generated by the project. Additionally, the proposed project would be in compliance with all State and local regulations regulating solid waste disposal. Therefore, impact would be less than significant.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| XX. <u>WILDFIRE</u> . If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:   |                                |                                       |                              |           |
| a) Substantially impact an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?   |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildlife risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?   |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? |                                |                                       |                              | X         |
| d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?  |                                |                                       |                              | X         |

a. See Item IX.f.

b-d. The project sites are not located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. The project sites are located within the service boundaries of an existing fire station which can adequately serve the project sites. Other fire stations are also located in close proximity to the project site which can provide service if needed. Additionally, the proposed projects would be constructed in accordance with all existing and applicable building and fire codes. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>  |                                |                                       |                              |           |
| a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? |                                | X                                     |                              |           |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulative considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?   |                                |                                       | X                            |           |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?  |                                | X                                     |                              |           |

a-c. The proposed projects consist of subdividing the subject sites into a combined total of 34 individual lots for single family residences in the R-7,000 zone. Cumulative impacts are the change in the environment, which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects. Two projects were identified within a mile of the proposed projects: TTM 61118 and TTM 60294.

- TTM 60294 is located directly south of Site 1 and has been approved for a 99 single-family subdivision. This project is currently under construction.
- TTM 61118 is located directly south of Site 2 and was approved for a 33 single-family subdivision.

The proposed projects would not create any impacts with respect to: Agriculture and Forest Resources, Energy, Land Use/Planning, Mineral Resources, Tribal Cultural Resources, or Wildfire. The projects would create impacts to other resource areas and mitigation measures have identified for Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils, and Hazards/Hazardous Materials. Many of the impacts generated by projects are site specific and generally do not influence the impacts on another site. All projects undergo environmental review and have required mitigation measures to reduce impacts when warranted. These

mitigation measures reduce environmental impacts to less than significant levels whenever possible. All impacts associated with the proposed project are less than significant with the exception of air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils (soil erosion), and hazards/hazardous materials. Impacts associated with these issues are less than significant with the incorporation of the identified mitigation measures. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

List of Referenced Documents and Available Locations\*:

|           |   |     |
|-----------|---|-----|
| BRR1      | Focused Survey for Agassiz's Desert Tortoise, Habitat Assessment for Burrowing Owl and Mohave Ground Squirrel, and General Biological Resource Assessment for a 6.5-acre± Site (APN 3203-008-045) in the City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California, Circle Mountain Biological Consultants, Inc., February 2014.  | DSD |
| BRR2      | Focused Survey for Agassiz's Desert Tortoise, Habitat Assessment for Burrowing Owl and Mohave Ground Squirrel, and General Biological Resource Assessment for a 3.25-acre± Site (APN 3203-008-046) in the City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California, Circle Mountain Biological Consultants, Inc., February 2014. | DSD |
| BRR3      | Reevaluation of Biological Resources on Two Parcels (APNs 3203-008-045 & -046) in the City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, CA, Circle Mountain Biological Consultants, Inc., January 30, 2019   | DSD |
| CRS       | Phase I Cultural Resource Investigation for Approximately 6.5 Acres Northeast of the Intersection of 65 <sup>th</sup> Street West and Newgrove Street, Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California, RT Factfinders Cultural Resources, January 2019   | DSD |
| ESA       | Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report for Two Vacant Parcels, Lancaster, CA 93536, APN: 3203-008-045 & 3203-008-046, Priority 1 Environmental, January 9, 2019   | DSD |
| FIRM:     | Flood Insurance Rate Map  | DSD |
| GPEIR:    | Lancaster General Plan Environmental Impact Report  | DSD |
| LACW1     | Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 letter for TTM 72648, March 13, 2019  | DSD |
| LACW2     | Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 letter for TTM 72649, March 13, 2019  | DSD |
| LGP:      | Lancaster General Plan  | DSD |
| LMC:      | Lancaster Municipal Code  | DSD |
| LMEA:     | Lancaster Master Environmental Assessment   | DSD |
| SSHZ:     | State Seismic Hazard Zone Maps  | DSD |
| TRA1      | Traffic CEQA Initial Study Form, TTM 82830, March 10, 2020  | DSD |
| TRA2      | Traffic CEQA Initial Study Form, TTM 82831, March 10, 2020  | DSD |
| USDA SCS: | United States Department of Agriculture<br>Soil Conservation Service Maps   | DSD |
| USGS:     | United States Geological Survey Maps  | DSD |

\* DSD: Development Services Department  
Community Development Division  
Lancaster City Hall  
44933 Fern Avenue  
Lancaster, California 93534