

-
1. **Project title and File Number:** Site Plan Review No. 19-07
 2. **Lead agency name and address:** City of Lancaster
Development Services Department
44933 Fern Avenue
Lancaster, California 93534
 3. **Contact person and phone number:** Jocelyn Swain, Senior Planner
Community Development Division
(661) 723-6100
 4. **Location:** ±13.05 acres at the northeast corner of
Avenue J-4 and 17th Street East
1752 East Avenue J-4
(APN: 3148-041-001)
 5. **Applicant name and address:** USA Property Fund
Attn: Leatha Clark
3200 Douglas Blvd, Suite 200
Roseville, CA 95661
 6. **General Plan designation:** MR2 (Multi-Residential, 15.1 – 30 dwelling
units/acre)
 7. **Zoning:** High Density Residential (HDR, 15.1 – 30
dwelling units to the acre)
 8. **Description of project:**

The proposed project involves the construction and operation of a 264-unit apartment complex in the HDR zone. The development would provide residential units to low-income individuals. A total of 10% of the units will be restricted to those with an income of 50% of the area median income (AMI) and 90% of the units will be restricted to those with an income of 60% of AMI. These units would deed restricted. Two of the units would be reserved for the on-site managers. Additionally, a density bonus request was submitted in order to receive concessions with respect to some of the development standards (parking reduction and in-unit laundry facilities). These requests have been incorporated into the site plan (Figure 1).



Figure 1, Conceptual Site Plan

The development would have a total of 11, 3-story residential buildings, a community center, and maintenance facilities. These buildings would provide 84 1-bedroom units; 90 2-bedroom units; 66 3-bedroom units; and 24 4-bedroom units. Laundry facilities would be provided in two buildings in the complex. Recreational and open space areas include the community center, pool facility, two open space areas with jogging trails around the perimeter, a barbeque area, and a tot lot play area. A total of 531 parking spaces would be provided through a combination of covered carports and uncovered spaces.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The project site is located in a developed area at the eastern edge of the City's core. The project site is predominantly surrounded by residential uses, both single family residences and multi-family residential apartment complexes. A shopping center is located immediately north of the project site and a small undeveloped lot is located at the northwest corner of the project site. Table 1 summarizes the zoning and land uses for the surrounding properties.

**Table 1
Zoning/Land Use Information**

Direction	Zoning		Land Use
	City	County	
North	C	N/A	Shopping center, vacant land, First Christian Church
East	HDR	N/A	Apartment Complex
South	MDR	N/A	Apartment Complex
West	R-7,000	N/A	Single family residential subdivision

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:

- Los Angeles County Sanitation District
- Los Angeles County Waterworks, District 40
- Los Angeles County Fire Department
- Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (dust control plan)

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 six tribes (eight individuals) that were identified by the Native American Heritage Commission or had directly contacted the City for notification via certified, return receipt mail on March 3, 2020. These letters included copies of the site plan, cultural resources report, and an aerial photograph. Table 2 identifies the tribes, individual to whom the letter was directed and the date the letter was received.

Table 2
Tribal Notification

Tribe	Person/Title	Date Received
San Fernando Band of Mission Indians	Donna Yocum/Chairperson	March 11, 2020
San Manuel Band of Mission Indians	Lee Clauss/Director of Cultural Resources	March 6, 2020
Morongo Band of Mission Indians	Robert Martin/Chairperson	March 6, 2020
Serrano Nation of Mission Indians	Mark Cochrane/ Co-Chairperson	March 6, 2020
Serrano Nation of Mission Indians	Wayne Walker/Co-Chairperson	March 6, 2020
Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians	Jairo Avila/Tribal Historic and Cultural Preservation Officer	March 6, 2020
Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians	Rudy Ortega/Tribal President	March 6, 2020
Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians	Andrew Salas/Chairman	March 6, 2020

Of the six tribes, three responded to the City's letter. The Morongo Band of Mission Indians responded on March 13, 2020 via email that they had no comments at this time. On April 9, 2020 the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians responded via email stating that they had no specific concerns; however, they requested that mitigation measures be included which address the process to be followed in the event that cultural resources are encountered during the course of project construction. The measures provided by the tribe have been included under the cultural resources section. On March 26, 2020, the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians sent an email requesting copies of the grading plans and geotechnical report. On April 8, 2020 the City provided a copy of the geotechnical report and explained that as this was the entitlement phase, a grading plan was not required. The City also offered to forward any questions that the tribe may have on the project to the development team for response. On April 14, 2020 the tribe responded that due to the possibility for inadvertent discoveries, they were requesting specific mitigation measures to be included. These measures have also been included in the cultural resources section.

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.


Jocelyn Swain, Senior Planner


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 five scenic areas in the City and immediately surrounding area (LMEA Figure 12.0-1). Views of these scenic areas are not visible from the project site or the immediately surrounding roadways. However, views of the mountains surrounding the Antelope Valley are available from the project site and roadways. With implementation of the proposed project, these views would not change and would continue to be available from the roadways and project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- b. The project site has been previously graded for development and does not contain any aesthetic features. The project site is not located along a State scenic highway or a scenic roadway as designated in the City's General Plan. Additionally, the project site does not contain any rock outcroppings, buildings (historic or otherwise), or large trees. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- c. Development of the proposed project would change the visual character of the project site from a previously graded vacant lot to a 264-unit apartment complex. The proposed project is consistent with the standards identified in the City's Design Guidelines for residential developments and would be compatible with the surrounding single family residences and apartment complexes. The proposed project is also in conformance with the City's General Plan and zoning requirements for the HDR zone. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- d. Ambient light in the vicinity of the project site is moderate to high due to the surrounding residential and commercial uses. Light generated in the area is primarily from vehicle headlights, street lights, lighting from the residential uses, and security lighting from the shopping center to the north. The proposed project would generate light from street lights, vehicle headlights, interior residential lighting and security lighting throughout the complex. A photometric plan was prepared and shows that there would be no light spillage beyond the boundaries of the project site. All lighting on the project site would be shielded and focused downward. Additionally, the proposed project 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, Other Land, and Water.

The maps for each county are updated every two years. The Los Angeles County Farmland Map was last updated in 2018; however, the 2018 map has not been published. Based on the 2016 map, the project site is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land.

Urban and Built-Up Land is defined as “land is occupied by structures with a building density of at least 1 unit to 1.5 acres, or approximately 6 structures to a 10-acre parcel. Common examples include residential, industrial, commercial, institutional facilities, cemeteries, airports, golf course, sanitary landfills, sewage treatment, and water control structures.” As the project site is not designated as farmland of importance by the State nor is it currently utilized for agricultural purposes, no impacts to agricultural resources would occur.

- b. The project site is designated as HDR (High Density Residential) which does not allow for agricultural uses. Additionally, the project site is located in the central portion of the City and is surrounded by commercial and residential development on property which does not allow for agricultural uses. The project site is not under agricultural production and none of the surrounding properties are under agricultural production. Additionally, the project site and surrounding area are not subject to a Williamson Act contract. 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 (GPEIR pgs. 5.5-21 to 5.5-22). The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan and no impacts would occur.
- b. The project site is located within the boundaries of the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) and therefore, is subject to compliance with the thresholds established by the AVAQMD. These thresholds are identified in the AVAQMD's *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Federal Conformity Guidelines* document dated August 2016. The thresholds are summarized in Table 3.

An air quality analysis was prepared by LSA to calculate the air and greenhouse gas emissions that would be generated during the construction and operation of the proposed project. This analysis was documented in a report entitled "Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis" and dated March 2020.

Table 3
AVAQMD Air Quality Thresholds

Criteria Pollutant	Annual Threshold (Tons)	Daily Threshold (lbs)
Greenhouse gas (CO ₂ e)	100,000	548,000
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	100	548
Nitrogen Oxides (NO _x)	25	137
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)	25	137
Sulfur Oxides (SO _x)	25	137
PM ₁₀	15	82
PM _{2.5}	12	65
Hydrogen Sulfide (H ₂ S)	10	54
Lead	0.6	3

Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to start in August 2020 and be complete by the beginning part of 2023. Construction would be divided into six phases: demolition, site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating. The daily and annual emissions associated with construction were calculated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod version 2016.3.2) and are provided in Tables 4 and 5.

These emissions do not exceed the daily or annual thresholds established by the air district for construction. Additionally, the proposed project would be required to comply with all air district rules and regulations pertaining to construction including Rule 403. As such, air quality impacts associated with construction would be less than significant.

The air quality analysis also estimated the yearly emissions associated with the operation of the apartment complex including emissions from area, energy, and mobile sources. The daily and yearly operational emissions are provided in Tables 6 and 7. As shown, operational emissions would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Table 4
Daily Regional Construction Emissions

Construction Year	Total Regional Pollutant Emissions (lbs/day)					
	VOCs	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM₁₀	PM_{2.5}
2020	5	50	33	<1	20	12
2021	3	25	29	<1	4	2
2022	57	22	28	<1	4	2
2023	57	1	4	<1	<1	<1
Maximum	57	50	33	<1	20	12
AVAQMD Threshold	137	137	548	137	82	65
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Table 5
Annual Regional Construction Emissions

Construction Year	Total Regional Pollutant Emissions (tons/year)					
	VOCs	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
2020	0.2	2.0	1.5	<0.1	0.4	0.2
2021	0.4	3.2	3.6	<0.1	0.5	0.2
2022	1.4	2.4	2.9	<0.1	0.4	0.2
2023	0.7	0.1	0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Maximum	1.4	3.2	3.6	<0.1	0.5	0.2
AVAQMD Threshold	25	25	100	25	15	12
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Table 6
Daily Regional Operational Emissions

Construction Year	Total Regional Pollutant Emissions (lbs/day)					
	VOCs	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Area	7	<1	22	<1	<1	<1
Energy	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Mobile	3	11	34	<1	9	2
Total Project Emissions	10	13	56	<1	9	3
AVAQMD Threshold	137	137	548	137	82	65
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Table 7
Annual Regional Operational Emissions

Construction Year	Total Regional Pollutant Emissions (tons/year)					
	VOCs	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
2020	0.2	2.0	1.5	<0.1	0.4	0.2
2021	0.4	3.2	3.6	<0.1	0.5	0.2
2022	1.4	2.4	2.9	<0.1	0.4	0.2
Maximum	1.4	3.2	3.6	<0.1	0.5	0.2
AVAQMD Threshold	25	25	100	25	15	12
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No

- c. The closest sensitive receptors to the project site are the single- and multi-family residential uses immediately adjacent to the west, east, and south. Carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations near a congested roadway or intersection may reach unhealthful levels, affecting local sensitive receptors (e.g., residents, school children, elderly, hospital patients, etc.). Typically, high CO concentrations are associated with roadways or intersections operating at unacceptable levels of

service or with extremely high traffic volumes. In areas with high background levels CO concentrations, modeling is recommended to determine the project's effect on local CO levels. The background levels of CO, as reported by the Lancaster Air Monitoring Station on Division Street showed the highest recorded 1-hour concentration of 2.6 parts per million (ppm) and the highest 8-hour concentration of 1.5 ppm for the past three years. The State standard is 20 ppm and 9 ppm, respectively. As the background levels of CO in the City of Lancaster are low and the traffic study shows that all intersections and roadway segments would operate at an acceptable level with the improvements identified in the traffic section, no CO hotspots would occur.

However, since the construction of the proposed project 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 Measures 9 through 12 (see Geology and Soils) which requires the project operator to implement dust control measures in compliance with AVAQMD Rule 403, and implementation of Mitigation Measure 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 and operation of the proposed project is not anticipated to produce significant objectionable odors. Construction equipment may generate some odors, but these odors would be similar to those odors produced by vehicles traveling along Avenue J and 20th Street East. 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. Odors may be generated as a result of typical activities found in a residential setting such as cooking, barbequing, gardening, etc. However, these odors are considered normal and acceptable for the use and impacts would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No 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. A biological resources survey was conducted on the project site by Mark Hagan and documented in a report entitled "Biological Resource Assessment of APN 3148-041-001, Lancaster, California" and dated November 5, 2019.

As part of the report, a survey of the project site was conducted on October 22, 2019 by walking east-west transects spaced approximately 50 to 75 feet apart. The project site is characteristic of a previously disturbed parcel. Heavy trash was noted along the eastern portion of the project site

including household items and furniture. Old concrete building foundations were also noted on the project site. A total of 20 plant species and 19 wildlife species were observed during the site survey (see Tables 8 and 9). No special status plant or animal species were observed on the project site during the survey and none are expected to occur due to the highly disturbed nature of the site and the surrounding development. However, it is possible that nesting birds could be present on the project site at the time that development is proposed to start. In order to ensure that any potential impacts to nesting birds remain less than significant, the mitigation measure identified below is required. With implementation of the mitigation measure, impacts would be less than significant.

Table 8
Observed Plant Species

American elm (<i>Ulmus americana</i>)	Four-wing saltbush (<i>Atriplex canescens</i>)	Rabbit brush (<i>Chrysothamnus nauseosus</i>)
Black-eyed susan (<i>Rudbeckia hirta</i>)	Fiddleneck (<i>Amsinckia tessellata</i>)	Herb willow (<i>Epilobium</i> sp)
Russian thistle (<i>Salsola iberica</i>)	Bunch grass	Schismus (<i>Schismus</i> sp.)
Red brome (<i>Bromus rubens</i>)	Foxtail barley (<i>Hordeum leporinum</i>)	Cheatgrass (<i>Bromus tectorum</i>)
Red stemmed filaree (<i>Erodium cicutarium</i>)	Russian knapweed (<i>Rhaponticum repens</i>)	Annual burweed (<i>Franseria acanthicarpa</i>)
Tumble mustard (<i>Sisymbrium altissimum</i>)	Rattlesnake weed (<i>Euphorbia albomarginata</i>)	Prickly lettuce (<i>Lactuca seriola</i>)
Horseweed (<i>Canyza honariensis</i>)	Bermuda grass (<i>Cynodon dactylon</i>)	

Table 9
Observed Animal Species

California ground squirrel (<i>Citellus beecheyi</i>)	Black-tailed jackrabbit (<i>Lepus californicus</i>)	Desert cottontail (<i>Sylvilagus auduboni</i>)
Domestic dog (<i>Canis familiaris</i>)	Domestic cat (<i>felis catus</i>)	Gull sp
Rock dove (<i>Columba livia</i>)	Hummingbird sp	Common raven (<i>Corvus corax</i>)
Say's phoebe (<i>Sayornis saya</i>)	Northern mockingbird (<i>Mimus polyglottos</i>)	Horned lark (<i>Eremophila alpestris</i>)
Western meadowlark (<i>Sturnella neglecta</i>)	Harvester ants	Grasshopper spp (2)
Dragonfly	European honey bees	Butterfly (white)

Mitigation Measures

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. No construction activities shall occur within 500 feet of an active raptor nest.

- b. The project site does 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 impacts would occur.
- c. There are no State or federally protected wetlands on the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- d. The project site is not part of an established migratory wildlife corridor. The project site is an infill site completely surrounded by development and roadways with minimal habitat value for wildlife. The project site is not connected to any other undeveloped property. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- e. The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances, such as a tree preservation policy, protecting biological resources. The proposed project 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 site. The West Mojave Coordinated Habitat Conservation Plan only applies to Bureau of Land Management properties and as such does not apply to the proposed project. 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 for the project site was conducted by BCR Consulting, LLC and documented in a report entitled "Cultural Resource Assessment, APN 3148-041-001 Project, City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California" and dated November 12, 2019.

A cultural resources records search was conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) along with a request for a Sacred Lands File Search through the Native American Heritage Commission. The records search indicated that 26 previous cultural resources surveys and two cultural resources have been recorded within a mile of the project site. The two cultural resources were an historic period house and an historic period refuse site. None of the previous surveys covered the project site. Additionally, the sacred lands file search requested by the City on came back with negative results as indicated in the letter from the Native American Heritage Commission on January 29, 2020.

A survey of the project site was conducted on October 3, 2019 by walking parallel transects spaced approximately 15 meters apart across the project site. No cultural resources, including prehistoric or historic archaeological sites or historic-period buildings were identified on the project site.

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

While no cultural resources, historic or prehistoric, were identified or expected to be encountered on the project site; the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians have requested the following mitigation measures which identify procedures to be followed in the event that any cultural resources are encountered on the project site during construction. With implementation of these measures, all impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

3. 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 the 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 and the San Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians shall be contacted regarding any pre-contact finds and be provide information after the archaeologist makes his/her initial assessment of the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment.
4. If significant pre-contact cultural resources, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), are discovered and avoidance cannot be ensured, the archaeologist shall develop a Monitoring and Treatment Plan, the drafts of which shall be provided to both the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the San Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians for review and comment. The archaeologist shall monitor the remainder of the project and implement the Plan accordingly.
5. 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 enforced for the duration of the project.
6. The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department and the San Ferandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians shall be contacted if any pre-contact cultural resources are discovered during project implementation and be provided with 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 (as amended, 2015), a cultural resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan shall be created by the archaeologist, in coordination with both tribes, and all subsequent finds shall be subject to this Plan. This plan shall allow for a monitor to be present that represents both tribes for the remainder of the project, should either or both tribes elect to place a monitor on-site.
7. Any and all archaeological/cultural documents created as a part of the project (isolate records, site records, survey reports, testing, etc.) shall be supplied to the applicant and Lead Agency for dissemination to both tribes. The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith consult with both tribes throughout the life of the project.
8. The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians on the disposition and treatment of any Tribal Cultural Resources encountered during project grading.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No 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 project 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 project 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. 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 apartments constructed as a result of the proposed project would comply with all of these regulations and would not conflict or obstruct with a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No 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 site is 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 site 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 reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level. The site is generally level and is 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 site is not located in an area at risk for liquefaction. No impacts would occur.

- b. The project site is 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 project 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.

Mitigation Measures

9. 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.
 10. When water is used for dust control, watering shall occur three times per day and shall be increased to four times per day when there is evidence of visible wind driven fugitive dust.
 11. Signage shall be displayed on the project site in accordance with AVAQMD Rule 403 (Appendix A).
 12. All disturbed surfaces shall meet the definition of a stabilized surface upon completion of project construction.
- 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 project site is not known to be within an area subject to fissuring, sinkholes, or subsidence or any other form of geologic unit or soil instability. The closest fissuring and sinkholes are located around Avenue I and 30th Street West, approximately 5 miles west of the project site. 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 site is characterized by a low shrink/swell potential (LMEA Figure 2-3). A soils report for the proposed project 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 project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- e. The proposed project would be tied into the sanitary sewer system. No septic or alternative means of waste water disposal are part of the proposed project. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- f. The project site was previously graded for development that was never constructed. There are no known paleontological resources or unique geologic features on the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No 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. As discussed in Item III, an air quality and greenhouse gas study was prepared by LSA for the proposed development (Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis, Lancaster 3 Project, Lancaster, California). As part of that study, the greenhouse gas emissions were calculated for both construction activities and long-term operational activities. Most of the greenhouse gas emissions would be generated by construction equipment/vehicles; gas, electricity and water usage; solid-waste disposal; and motor vehicle use associated with the proposed project. The estimated emissions were calculated in accordance with the methodology established by OPR and letters from the State Attorney General's office. Tables 10 and 11 show the estimated greenhouse gas emissions for construction and operation activities, respectively. As shown in these tables, the proposed project would not exceed the thresholds established by the AVAQMD and impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The proposed project would be in compliance with the greenhouse gas emission goals and policies identified in the City of Lancaster General Plan (LMEA pgs. 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.

Table 10
Short-Term Regional Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Construction Phase	Total Emission Per Phase (MT/yr)			Total Emissions per Phase (MT CO ₂ e/yr)
	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	
2020				
Demolition	35	<1	0	36
Site Preparation	17	<1	0	18
Grading	84	<1	0	85
Building Construction	148	<1	0	149
Total Annual GHG Emissions				287
2021				
Building Construction	783	<1	0	786
Total Annual GHG Emissions				786
2022				
Building Construction	598	<1	0	600
Paving	21	<1	0	21
Architectural Coatings	12	<1	0	12
Total Annual GHG Emissions				633
2023				
Architectural Coatings	7	<1	0	7
AVAQMD Threshold (100,000 tons = 101,605 metric tons)				101,605
Exceeds Threshold?				No

Table 11
Long-Term Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Source	Pollutant Emissions (MT/yr)			
	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e
Area	3	<1	0	3
Energy	539	<1	<1	541
Mobile	1,702	<1	0	1,703
Waste	25	1	0	61
Water	115	<1	<1	134
Total Project Emissions	2,441	1	0	2,500
AVAQMD Threshold (100,000 tons/year = 101,605 MT/year)				101,605
Exceeds Threshold?				No

	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 project consists of the construction and operation of a 264-unit apartment complex with a pool and recreational open space. Typical construction materials would be utilized during development of the proposed project. Occupants of the proposed project would typically utilize household cleaners (e.g., cleanser, bleach, etc.) and maintenance of the apartment complex would include the use of cleaners, fertilizer, pool maintenance materials and potentially limited use of common pesticides. These uses would be similar to the other residential developments

immediately surrounding the project site. All use of these materials would be in compliance with existing rules and regulations. The proposed project is not located along a hazardous materials transportation corridor (LMEA p. 9.1-14 and Figure 9,1-4). Development of the project site would not involve the demolition of any structures and 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 site is located within a quarter mile Lincoln Elementary School is located at 44021 15th Street East. However, the proposed project would only utilize hazardous materials typical of residential settings and would not generate hazardous emissions or acutely hazardous waste. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- d. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for the proposed project by Krazan & Associates, Inc. The findings of the study are documented in "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 1752 East Avenue J-4, APN: 3148-041-001 (11.34 Acres), Lancaster, California" dated June 19, 2019.

As part of the environmental site assessment, a site visit was conducted on May 22, 2019. The project site is predominantly vacant land with no significant features except for concrete buildings pads adjacent to Avenue J-4 which do not appear to have been utilized for buildings. Wind-blown litter and minor dumping of household refuse was observed on the project site. No hazardous materials, hazardous wastes, pole- or pad-mounted transformers were observed on the project site and the surface soils did not exhibit obvious signs of discoloration. No evidence of underground storage tanks was observed on the project site.

In addition to the site visit, a regulatory records review was conducted for the project site. The records search includes historical aerial photographs and regulatory databases. The project site and the adjacent properties were not identified in any regulatory database. One site was located approximately 500 feet northeast of the project: Century Plaza Cleaners/Plaza Dry Cleaners. This site was listed in the small quantity generator database. However, no violations are listed for this facility and no spills, releases or investigations are referenced. Based on its status, distance from project site and hydraulic location, this facility does not represent an environmental concern. The remaining properties identified in the regulatory database search are of sufficient distance and/or situated hydraulically cross/down gradient of the subject site and impacts are not likely. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- e. The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public/private airport. The nearest airfield, Air Force Plant 42, is located approximately two to three miles south of the project site. Therefore, no safety hazards for people residing in the project area would be anticipated and no impacts would occur.
- f. The traffic generated by the proposed project is not expected to block the roadways and improvements that have been conditioned as part of the project would ensure that traffic operates smoothly. Therefore, the proposed project 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 properties surrounding the project site are predominantly development; although there is a vacant lot at the northwest corner of the project site. It is possible that this property could be subject to a grass fire. The project site is located within the service area of Los Angeles County Fire Station No. 117, located at 44851 30th Street East, which would serve the project site in the event of a fire. Therefore, potential impacts from wildland fires would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No 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 proposed project consists of the construction and operation of a 264-unit low income apartment complex. Residential uses are not uses that would normally generate wastewater which violate water quality standards or exceeds waste discharge requirements. 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 project would incorporate appropriate BMPs during construction, as determined by the City of Lancaster Development Services Department. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- b. The proposed project would not include any groundwater wells or pumping activities. All water supplied to the proposed project would be obtained from the Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 (LACWD). Therefore, the proposed project would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge and impacts would be less than significant.
- c. Development of the proposed project would increase the amount of surface runoff as a result of impervious surfaces associated with the drive aisles, residential buildings, recreational facilities and parking areas. The proposed project would be designed, on the basis of a hydrology study, to accept current flows entering the property 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 site is not located within a coastal zone. Therefore, tsunamis are not a potential hazard. The project site is relatively flat and does not contain any enclosed bodies of water and is not located in close proximity to any other large bodies of water. Therefore, the proposed project would not be subject to inundation by seiches or mudflows. No impacts would occur.

The project site is designated as Flood Zone X per the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Panel No. 060672 (2008) (06037C0450F). Flood Zone X is located outside of both the 100-year flood zone and the 500-year flood zone. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

- e. The proposed project is residential in nature. As such, the proposed project 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 Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No 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 project consists of the construction and operation of a 264-unit low income apartment complex on a single undeveloped lot. The area surrounding the project site is developed predominantly with single family residences and apartment complexes. The proposed project 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 project is consistent with the City's General Plan and must be in conformance with the Lancaster Municipal Code. The proposed project 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 site is not subject to and would not conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No 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 site does not contain any mining or recovery operations for mineral resources and no such activities have occurred on the project site in the past. According to the LMEA (Figure 2-4 and page 2-8), the project site 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 Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE. 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?				X

- a-b. A noise and vibration study was prepared for the proposed project by LSA and documented in a report entitled "Noise and Vibration Impact Analysis, Lancaster 3 Project, Lancaster, California" and dated March 2020.

As part of the noise study, noise measurements were taken at various locations around the perimeter of the project site. Two short-term (20 minute) noise measurements were taken on February 12, 2020 and three long-term (24-hour) measurements were taken between February 12 and February 13. Tables 12 and 13 provide information regarding the noise measurement results.

Table 12
Short-Term Ambient Noise Level Measurements

Monitor No.	Location	Time	Noise Level				Noise Source
			dBA Leq	dBA L _{max}	dBA L _{min}	dBA CNEL	
ST-1	1832 E Ave J-2	10:30 am	43.8	58.5	38.9	49.0	Traffic/sirens, birds
ST-2	1835 E Ave J-2	11:00 am	48.5	66.9	44.1	54.8	Pool pump/heater, traffic, birds

Table 12
Long-Term Ambient Noise Monitoring Results

Monitoring No.	Location	Noise Level (dBA CNEL)	Noise Source
LT-1	1830 E. Ave J-4 near apt bldg. 1746	63.0	Light traffic on J-4, faint traffic from other roadways
LT-2	Across street from 44221 17 th St E	57.1	Light traffic on 17 th St E, faint traffic from other roadways
LT-3	North side of Ave J-2 at 1800 E Ave J, south side of building near loading dock	59.6	Light traffic on J-2, faint traffic from other roadways

Typical noise levels range up to 88 dBA L_{max} at 50 feet during the noisiest construction phases including excavation and grading. Project construction is expected to require the use of graders, bulldozers, and water trucks/pickup trucks. Noise associated with the use of each type of construction equipment for the site preparation phase is estimated to be between 55 and 85 dBA L_{max} at a distance of 50 feet. Assuming that each piece of construction equipment operates at some distance from the other equipment, the worst-case combined noise level during this phase of construction would be 88 dBA L_{max} at a distance of 50 feet from the active construction area.

The closest residential property line is within 50 feet of the project construction boundary and may be subject to short-term construction noise reaching 88 dBA L_{max} generated by construction activities in the project area. Noise levels generated by project construction would be higher than ambient noise levels and may result in a temporary increase in the ambient noise levels. In addition, single event noise levels generated by project construction would be greater than 15 dBA above the City's noise standard of 65 dBA for residential uses. However, construction noise would stop once project construction is completed. Implementation of the mitigation measures below (standard requirements) would minimize construction noise to less than significant levels.

A vibration analysis for the construction activities was also prepared. As presented in that analysis, construction activities would not result in building damage; however, the vibration may be an annoyance. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

13. Construction operations shall not occur between 8 p.m. and 7 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday or at any time on Sunday. The hours of any construction-related activities shall be restricted to periods and days permitted by local ordinance.
14. The on-site construction supervisor shall have the responsibility and authority to receive and resolve noise complaints. A clear appeal process to the owner shall be established prior to construction commencement that will allow for resolution of noise problems that cannot be immediately solved by the site supervisor.

15. Electrically powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, where feasible.
 16. Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking and maintenance areas shall be located as far away as practicable from noise-sensitive receptors.
 17. The use of noise producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells shall be for safety warning purposes only.
 18. No project-related public address or music system shall be audible at any adjacent receptor.
 19. All noise producing construction equipment and vehicles using internal combustion engines shall be equipped with mufflers, air-inlet silencers where appropriate, and any other shrouds, shields, or other noise-reducing features in good operating condition that meet or exceed original factory specifications. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors, etc.) shall be equipped with shrouds and noise control features that are readily available for the type of equipment.
- c. The project site is not in proximity to an airport or a frequent overflight area and would not experience noise from these sources. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. <u>POPULATION AND HOUSING.</u> Would the project:				
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 project involves the construction and operation of a 264-unit low income apartment complex. The proposed project 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 project or residing at the proposed project 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 site is currently vacant. No housing or people would be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No 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 project may increase the need for fire and police services during construction and operation; however, the project site is within the current service area of both these agencies and the additional time and cost to service the sites is minimal. The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth and therefore, would not increase the demand on parks or other public facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Construction of the proposed project may result in an incremental increase in population (see Item XIV) and may increase the number of students in the Lancaster School District and Antelope Valley Union High 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 Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No 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 project would generate additional population growth and would contribute on an incremental basis to the use of the existing park and recreational facilities. However, the proposed project included recreational amenities for the residents of the complex including jogging trails, tot lots, and a pool. Additionally, the applicant would be required to pay park fees which would offset the impacts of the existing parks. The development of the proposed project would not require the construction of new recreational facilities or the expansion of existing ones. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:				
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 project does not conflict with or impede any of the General Plan policies or specific actions related to alternative modes of transportation. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- b. A traffic study for the proposed project was prepared by LSA and documented in a report entitled "Traffic Study Lancaster 3, City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California" and dated March 2020. It is estimated that the proposed project would generate a total of 1,436 daily trips with 95 a.m. peak hour and 116 p.m. peak hour trips. The study analyzed the potential impacts as a result of the proposed project for existing and future buildout scenarios at the following six intersections and four roadway segments:

- 15th Street East & Avenue J-4
- 17th Street East & Avenue J-4
- Project Driveway 1/Park Circle Apartment Driveway & Avenue J-4
- Project Driveway 2/Shopping Center Driveway & Avenue J-2
- 20th Street East & Avenue J-2
- 20th Street East & Avenue J-4
- Avenue J-4 between 15th Street East and 17th Street East
- Avenue J-4 between 17th Street East and Project Driveway 1
- Avenue J-4 between Project Driveway 1 and 20th Street East
- 17th Street East between Avenue J-4 and Avenue J-8

Under existing conditions, the project would not significantly impact any of the roadway segments. However, it would significant impact the intersection of 20th Street East and Avenue

J-4 causing the level of service (LOS) to go from LOS D to LOS E. Under project buildout conditions, no roadway segments would have significant impacts. However, the same intersection identified above would be a LOS F with and without the project. With the implementation of the mitigation measures listed below, impacts to the roadway network would be less than significant.

Additionally, Senate Bill (SB) 743 requires that effective July 1, 2020, jurisdictions utilize vehicle miles traveled (VMT) to determine the significance of a traffic impact. It is anticipated that the proposed project would be approved prior to the July 1, 2020 deadline. Additionally, the City is currently in the process of adopting its standards and thresholds with respect to VMT. While the proposed project does not qualify to be screened from analysis as a residential project, it is not expected to generate VMT which exceeds the thresholds and would not have a substantial VMT impact.

Mitigation Measures

20. The applicant shall install a signal at the intersection of 20th Street East and Avenue J-4.
 21. The applicant shall add a northbound through lane to the intersection of 20th Street East and Avenue J-4. The applicant shall restripe and convert the dedicated left-turn lanes along 20th Street East to a two-way left turn lane.
- 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 site. No hazardous conditions would be created by these improvements. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
 - d. Access to the project site would be provided from East Avenue J-4 and an exit only would be provided on East Avenue J-4. This would provide adequate emergency access to and from the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. 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 tribal cultural resources have been identified by any of the Native American Tribes with cultural affiliations to the area. However, two tribes requested specific mitigation measures to be included that identify the procedures to be followed in the event that cultural resources are encountered during construction. These requests have been included as mitigation measures under the cultural resources section. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. 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 project would be required to connect into the existing utilities such as electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, telecommunications, etc. These services already exist adjacent to the project site. Connections would occur on the project site or within existing roadways or right-of-ways. Connections to these utilities are assumed as part of the proposed project and impacts to environmental resources have been discussed throughout the document. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 has not indicated any problems in supplying water to the proposed project from existing facilities. No new construction of water treatment or new or expanded entitlements would be required. Therefore, water impacts would be less than significant.

- c. The proposed project would discharge to local sewer lines which would ultimately connect to the District's trunk lines. The project's wastewater would be treated at the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant upon connection which has a design capacity of 18 million gallons per day (mgd). The wastewater generated by the proposed project would be within the existing capacity of the Lancaster Reclamation Plant. Therefore, 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 2030. 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 and organics. 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 project would generate solid waste during construction and operation which would contribute to an overall impact on landfill services (GPEIR pgs. 5.13-25 to 5.13-28 and 5.13-31); although the projects' contribution would be minimal. However, the existing landfill has capacity to handle the waste generated by the proposed project. Additionally, the proposed project would be in compliance with all State and local regulations regarding solid waste disposal. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. WILDFIRE. 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 site is not located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. The project site is located within the service boundaries of an existing fire station which can adequately serve the project site. Other fire stations are also located in close proximity to the project site which can provide service if needed. Additionally, the proposed project 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
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
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 project consists of the construction and operation of a 264-unit low-income apartment complex in the HDR 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. Table 13 identifies the three related projects located within a one-mile radius of the project site.

The proposed project would not create any impacts with respect to: Agriculture and Forest Resources, Energy, Land Use/Planning, Mineral Resources, Tribal Resources, and Wildfire. The project would create impacts to other resource areas and mitigation measures have identified for Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils, Noise and Traffic. 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), noise and traffic. 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.

Table 13
Related Projects List

Case No.	Location	Description	Status
DR 19-42	NWC of 20 th Street East & Avenue J	Remaining pads in existing shopping center	Under review
TTM 54025	SEC 20 th Street East & Lancaster Boulevard	Residential subdivision	Under construction
CUP 07-04	SEC Avenue J & 20 th St East	Shopping center	Partially constructed and operational

List of Referenced Documents and Available Locations*:

AIR	Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis, Lancaster 3 Project, Lancaster, California, LSA, March 2020	DSD
BRR:	Biological Resource Assessment of APN 3148-041-001, Lancaster, California, Mark Hagan, November 5, 2019	DSD
CRS:	Cultural Resources Assessment, APN 3148-041-001 Project City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California, BCR Consulting, LLC, November 12, 2019	DSD
ESA:	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 1752 East Avenue J-4, APN: 3148-041-001 (11.34 acres), Lancaster, California, Krazan & Associates, Inc., June 19, 2019	DSD
FIRM:	Flood Insurance Rate Map	DSD
GEO	Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Proposed Lancaster Apartments, 1752 East Avenue J-4, Lancaster, California, Krazan & Associates, Inc., June 16, 2019	DSD
GPEIR:	Lancaster General Plan Environmental Impact Report	DSD
LGP:	Lancaster General Plan	DSD
LMC:	Lancaster Municipal Code	DSD
LMEA:	Lancaster Master Environmental Assessment	DSD
NOI	Noise and Vibration Impact Analysis, Lancaster 3 Project Lancaster, California, LSA, March 2020	DSD
SSHZ:	State Seismic Hazard Zone Maps	DSD
TRA	Traffic Study, Lancaster 3, City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California, LSA, March 2020	DSD
USGS:	United States Geological Survey Maps	DSD
USDA SCS:	United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Maps	DSD

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