HELIX Environmental Planning

Littlerock Creek Recharge Project

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

July 2025 | 02700.00001.001

Prepared for:

Antelope Valley State Water Contractors Association
6450 West Avenue N
Palmdale, CA 93551

Prepared by:

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.
7578 El Cajon Boulevard
La Mesa, CA 91942

This page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section			Page
DRAFT NEGATIVE DECLARATION			**ND-1**
1.0	**INTRODUCTION**		**1**
	1.1	Initial Study Information Sheet	1
	1.2	Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	2
	1.3	Determination	3
2.0	**ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**		**4**
	I.	Aesthetics	5
	II.	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	6
	III.	Air Quality	7
	IV.	Biological Resources	8
	V.	Cultural Resources	10
	VI.	Energy	11
	VII.	Geology and Soils	12
	VIII.	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	14
	IX.	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	15
	X.	Hydrology and Water Quality	17
	XI.	Land Use and Planning	19
	XII.	Mineral Resources	19
	XIII.	Noise	20
	XIV.	Population and Housing	21
	XV.	Public Services	22
	XVI.	Recreation	23
	XVII.	Transportation	23
	XVIII.	Tribal Cultural Resources	24
	XIX.	Utilities and Service Systems	25
	XX.	Wildfire	27
	XXI.	Mandatory Findings of Significance	28
3.0	**REFERENCES**		**30**
4.0	**PREPARERS**		**31**

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

LIST OF FIGURES

No.	Title	Follows Page
1	Regional Location	2
2	Aerial Photograph	2

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AFY	acre-feet per year
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
AVSWCA	Antelope Valley State Water Contactors Association
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
cfs	cubic feet per second
DWR	California Department of Water Resources
EIR	environmental impact report
GHG	greenhouse gas
Project	Littlerock Creek Recharge Project
SWP	State Water Project
VHFHSZ	very high fire hazard severity zone

This page intentionally left blank

DRAFT NEGATIVE DECLARATION

1.	Project title:	Littlerock Creek Recharge Project
2.	Project description:	The proposed Project would involve diverting water from the California Aqueduct into Littlerock Creek, where it would naturally percolate into the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin. The water would be diverted using an existing California Aqueduct turnout with a capacity of 20 cubic feet per second. Recharge would only occur when there are surplus State Water Project supplies available and would total up to 15,000 acre-feet per year.
3.	Project location:	Littlerock, Los Angeles County, CA
4.	Lead Agency:	Antelope Valley State Water Contractors Association 6450 West Avenue N Palmdale, CA 93551

The Lead Agency, having reviewed the Initial Study for this Project, does hereby find and declare that the Project will not have a significant effect on the environment. A brief statement of the reasons supporting the Lead Agency's findings are as follows:

An Initial Study was conducted to evaluate the potential effects of this Project upon the environment. Based upon the findings contained in the attached Initial Study, it has been determined that the Project would result in less than significant or no impacts to all environmental issue areas considered herein, including: aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation, tribal cultural resources, utilities and service systems, and wildfire. Accordingly, a Draft Negative Declaration has been prepared.

The Lead Agency hereby finds that the Negative Declaration reflects its independent judgment. A copy of the Initial Study is attached.

The location and custodian of the documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the Lead Agency based its decision to adopt this Negative Declaration are as follows:

Antelope Valley State Water Contractors Association
6450 West Avenue N
Palmdale, CA 93551
www.avswca.org/news-events

Signature

7-24-25
Date

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 INITIAL STUDY INFORMATION SHEET

1.	Project title:	Littlerock Creek Recharge Project
2.	Lead agency name and address:	Antelope Valley State Water Contractors Association 6450 West Avenue N, Palmdale, CA 93551
3.	Contact person and phone number:	Tom Barnes, AVEK Water Agency, Water Resources Manager 661-943-3201
4.	Project location:	Littlerock, Los Angeles County, CA
5.	Project sponsor's name and address:	See Item 2
6.	General plan designation:	N/A
7.	Zoning:	N/A

8. Description of project:

The Antelope Valley State Water Contractors Association (AVSWCA) was created in 1999 as a joint powers authority in an effort to optimize the use of water resources and protect surface water and groundwater storage within the Antelope Valley. The AVSWCA member agencies have contracts with the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) for entitlement to and delivery of State Water Project (SWP) water from the California Aqueduct, which traverses the Antelope Valley. In response to DWR's request for AVSWCA to find creative ways to maximize the use of SWP water in a 100 percent SWP allocation year and proactively respond to Executive Order N-4-23 issued on March 10, 2023, by Governor Newsom to maximize groundwater recharge in wet years, AVSWCA conduced a pilot project in 2023 for direct recharge of SWP water to Littlerock Creek. Based on the success of the pilot project, AVSWCA is now pursuing a permanent recharge project, which is the proposed Littlerock Creek Recharge Project (Project) considered in this Initial Study.

As with the pilot project, the proposed Project would involve diverting water from the California Aqueduct into Littlerock Creek, where it would naturally percolate into the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin (Figure 1, *Regional Location*, and Figure 2, *Aerial Photograph*). The water would be diverted using an existing turnout with a capacity of 20 cubic feet per second (cfs) located along the California Aqueduct. Specifically, water would be diverted into an existing 24-inch diameter pipeline by opening a sluice gate at the turnout. The water would then flow through an existing DWR meter to an existing distribution box by opening a second sluice gate located at the distribution box. From the distribution box, water would flow into an existing basin and then into Littlerock Creek via an existing pipeline.

Recharge would only occur when there are surplus SWP supplies available and would total up to 15,000 acre-feet per year (AFY). The maximum daily diversion would be 39.6 acre-feet. The Project does not involve physical improvements (i.e., construction). Operational activities associated with the Project

would be limited to opening and closing of the two sluice gates to divert flows into the creek. No changes in other operational/maintenance activities from existing conditions would occur.

9. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement:

DWR's approval would be required for the proposed delivery of SWP water.

10. 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.?

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 (Assembly Bill 52), California Native American tribes traditionally and cultural affiliated with the project area can request notification of projects in their traditional cultural territory. At this time, no Native American tribes have requested that AVSWCA provide notification to the tribe of projects in the tribe's area of traditional and cultural affiliation.

1.2 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" or "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Energy
☐ Geology and Soils	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology and Water Quality	☐ Land Use and Planning	☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Noise	☐ Population and Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities and Service Systems	☐ Wildfire	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance



I:\PROJECTS\A\AntelopeValleyWater_02700\00001_LittlerockCreekRecharge\Map\S\Figures.aprx 02700.00001.001 8/14/2024 - RK

HELIX Environmental Planning

Regional Location

Figure 1



I:\PROJECTS\A\AntelopeValleyWater_02700\00001_LittlerockCreekRecharge\Map\IS\Figures.aprx Fig2_Aerial : 02700.00001.001: 8/15/2024 - RK

0 200 Feet

Source: Aerial Photo (Esri, 2021)

HELIX Environmental Planning

Aerial Photograph

Figure 2

1.3 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 (EIR) is required, but it must analyze only the 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.

Signature	7-24-25 Date
Peter Thompson Printed name	AVSWCA For

2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

The lead agency has defined the column headings in the environmental checklist as follows:

A. "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.

B. "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the inclusion of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." All mitigation measures are described, including a brief explanation of how the measures reduce the effect to a less than significant level. Mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced.

C. "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the project does not create an impact that exceeds a stated significance threshold.

D. "No Impact" applies where a project does not create an impact in that category. "No Impact" answers do not require an explanation if they are adequately supported by the information sources cited by the lead agency which 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 would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project specific screening analysis).

The explanation of each issue identifies the significance criteria or threshold used to evaluate each question; and the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (CEQA Guidelines Section 15063[c][3][D]). Where appropriate, the discussion identifies the following:

a) Earlier Analyses Used. Identifies where earlier analyses are available for review.

b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identifies which effects from the checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and states 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 Incorporated," describes 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.

I. Aesthetics

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No impact. The Project does not involve the introduction of aboveground components and would therefore not have the potential to have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. No impact would occur.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements that would have the potential to substantially damage scenic resources. No impact would occur.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of 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?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements and would therefore not alter the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. No impact would occur.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

No impact. The Project would not introduce new components and would therefore not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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?

No impact. There is no land designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide in the immediate vicinity of the Project facilities (California Department of Conservation 2022). In addition, the Project does not propose new components that would have the potential to convert land from existing uses. No impact would occur.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No impact. The Project facilities are located on land zoned as Heavy Agriculture; however, these are existing facilities. The Project does not propose new components that would have the potential to conflict with zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. No impact would occur.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220[g]), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104[g])?

No impact. There is no land zoned as forest land or timberland in the vicinity of the Project facilities. In addition, the Project does not propose new components that would have the potential to conflict with zoning for forest land or timberland. No impact would occur.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No impact. There is no forest land in the vicinity of the Project facilities. In addition, the Project does not propose new components that would have the potential to result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

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?

No impact. The Project does not 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. No impact would occur.

III. Air Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

No impact. Local air quality districts are required, pursuant to the federal Clean Air Act, to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants for which their air basin is in nonattainment. Strategies to achieve these

emissions reductions are developed in air quality management plans (AQMPs). These strategies typically focus on land use and transportation controls, which are directly tied to population growth forecasts. Generally, if a project would not result in unplanned population growth, it would not conflict with the AQMP. The proposed Project would capture surplus SWP water supplies for groundwater storage to provide a buffer against hydrologic variability in the State. The Project would not generate population growth. In addition, as discussed below in Item III(b), the Project itself would not result in air pollutant emissions. As such, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, and no impact would occur.

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?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements and would therefore not require the use of construction equipment or vehicles that would generate criteria pollutants. Similarly, the Project does not involve new operational/maintenance activities beyond existing conditions that would result in new sources of criteria air pollutants during operations. As such, the Project would not 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. No impact would occur.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

No impact. As mentioned above in Item III(b), the Project would not result in air pollutant emissions; therefore, the Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. No impact would occur.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

No impact. The Project would not result in other emissions adversely affecting a substantial number of people. No impact would occur.

IV. Biological Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less than significant impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements and therefore would not result in direct effects, through means such as habitat removal, or indirect effects, through means such as noise generation, to special-status species. In addition, as discussed below in Item IV(b), the provision of water in Littlerock Creek would not result in habitat modifications that could affect species. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less than significant impact. Mojavean Semi-Desert Wash Scrub, a sensitive natural community, occurs along Littlerock Creek. Increased inundation would have the potential to affect this habitat through conversion; however, this natural community is associated with areas along Littlerock Creek that are outside of the low-flow channel (Conservation Biology Institute 2024). Since flows associated with the Project's discharges to the creek would be contained within the low-flow channel, the Project's discharges would not inundate, and would therefore not affect, the Mojavean Semi-Desert Wash Scrub. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

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?

Less than significant impact. Flows associated with the Project's discharges to Littlerock Creek, a jurisdictional resource, would be limited to the existing low-flow channel and would therefore not result in a substantial adverse effect on the creek. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

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?

No impact. The Project would discharge flows into an existing creek bed, which would not interfere with or create a new impediment to the migration of migratory fish or wildlife species or the use of native wildlife nursery sites. No impact would occur.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

No impact. The Project would not adversely affect biological resources and would therefore not have the potential to conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. No impact would occur.

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?

No impact. The Project would not adversely affect biological resources and would therefore not have the potential to conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No impact would occur.

V. Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements that would have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. No impact would occur.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements or other ground-disturbing activities that would have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. No impact would occur.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements or other ground-disturbing activities that would have the potential to disturb human remains. No impact would occur.

VI. Energy

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements or changes in operational/maintenance activities and would therefore not require the direct use of energy. Diverted water would be conveyed from the California Aqueduct to Littlerock Creek via gravity; no pumping, or associated energy use, would be required. In addition, while the conveyance of water through the California Aqueduct requires energy consumption for pumping, the Project would not result in the conveyance of water in the California Aqueduct that would not already be conveyed. The Project would divert existing flows. As such, the Project would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during construction or operation. No impact would occur.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

No impact. As discussed above in Item VI(a), the Project would not require the use of energy; therefore, the Project would not have potential to conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. No impact would occur.

VII. Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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.	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv. Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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?

   ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

   iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

   iv. Landslides?

No impact. The Project would not introduce new structures or uses that would have the potential to result in the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of an earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seism-related ground failure, or landslides. No impact would occur.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less than significant impact. Flows associated with the Project's discharges to Littlerock Creek would be contained within the existing low-flow channel and would be substantially less than the capacity of the low-flow channel. The Project's flows would therefore not result in substantial erosion or the loss of topsoil. Impacts would be less than significant.

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?

No impact. The Project would not introduce new structures or uses that would be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. No impact would occur.

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?

No impact. The Project would not introduce new structures or uses that would be located on expansive soil. No impact would occur.

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?

No impact. The Project does not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. No impact would occur.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements or other ground-disturbing activities that would have the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. No impact would occur.

VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements or changes in operational/maintenance activities and would therefore not result in the direct generation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Diverted water would be conveyed from the California Aqueduct to Littlerock Creek via gravity; no pumping, or associated energy use that could result in GHG emissions, would be required. In addition, while the conveyance of water through the California Aqueduct requires energy consumption (resulting in GHG emissions) for pumping, the Project would not result in the conveyance of water in the California Aqueduct that would not already be conveyed. The Project would divert existing flows. As such, the Project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly, or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. No impact would occur.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

No impact. As discussed above in Item VIII(a), the Project would not result in GHG emissions; therefore, the Project would not have potential to conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of GHGs. No impact would occur.

IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements or changes in operational/maintenance activities and would therefore not require the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. No impact would occur.

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?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements or changes in operational/maintenance activities and would therefore not introduce the potential to 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. No impact would occur.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements or changes in operational/maintenance activities and would therefore not result in hazardous emissions or the handling or hazardous materials. In addition, there are no schools within one-quarter mile of the Project facilities. No impact would occur.

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?

No impact. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (Cortese List) requirements, the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker database (2024) and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database (2024) were searched for hazardous materials sites in proximity to the Project facilities. No hazardous materials sites are listed at or near the Project facilities. No impact would occur.

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?

No impact. The closest airport to the Project facilities is Palmdale Regional Airport, located approximately 8.5 miles to the north. The Project facilities are not located within the airport influence area of Palmdale Regional Airport (Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission 2003). As such, the Project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area. In addition, the Project would not introduce people to the area that could be subject to aircraft safety hazards or noise. No impact would occur.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements or changes in operational/maintenance activities that could affect roadways; therefore, the Project would not have the potential to impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impact would occur.

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

Less than significant impact. The Project facilities are located within a very high fire hazard severity zone (VHFHSZ; California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection 2024). However, the Project does not involve physical improvements or changes in operational/maintenance activities and would therefore not introduce new people or structures to the site. As such, the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. Impacts would be less than significant.

X. Hydrology and Water Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional resources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Less than significant impact. Water recharged by the Project is comprised entirely of SWP water; therefore, adverse water quality impacts to existing water in the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin are not anticipated (Kennedy Jenks 2019). The quality of SWP water delivered at the Project location is tested by AVSWCA member agencies at several water treatment plant locations along the SWP. Groundwater quality is also tested at pumping wells throughout the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin. As such, the Project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirement or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Less than significant impact. The Project would recharge up to 15,000 AFY of water into the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin. It would therefore increase groundwater supplies and contribute to sustainable groundwater management of the basin. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

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?

ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional resources of polluted runoff?

iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

Less than significant impact. The Project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. Flows associated with the Project's discharges would be contained within the existing low-flow channel of Littlerock Creek and would be substantially less than the capacity of the low-flow channel. The existing channel would thus be able to accommodate both Project and non-Project flows, and the Project would not alter the course of Littlerock Creek. The Project would also not add impervious surfaces. As such, the Project would not alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation, increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding, create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional resources of polluted runoff, or impede or redirect flood flows. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

No impact. The Project does not involve new facilities or changes in operational/maintenance activities that could introduce pollutants to the Project area. As such, the Project would not release pollutants due to inundation. No impact would occur.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Less than significant impact. The Project would recharge SWP water into the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin. As indicated above in Items X(a) and X(b), the Project would not substantially degrade groundwater quality, would increase groundwater supplies, and would contribute to sustainable groundwater management of the basin. As such, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

XI. Land Use and Planning

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Cause 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Physically divide an established community?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements and therefore would not introduce a new physical feature that could physically divide an established community. In addition, the Project's discharged flow would follow an existing watercourse and would also not introduce a new physical impediment. No impact would occur.

b) Cause 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?

No impact. The Project would utilize existing facilities, thus being consistent with the current land use. The Project does not involve physical improvements or changes in operational/maintenance activities and would therefore not introduce new uses that would have the potential to conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. No impact would occur.

XII. Mineral Resources

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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?

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?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements and would therefore not introduce structures or uses that would have the potential to result in the loss of availability of mineral resources. No impact would occur.

XIII. Noise

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements and would therefore not require the use of construction equipment or vehicles that would generate noise. Similarly, the Project does not involve new operational/maintenance activities beyond existing conditions that would result in new sources of noise during operations. As such, the Project would not result in the 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. No impact would occur.

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements and would therefore not require the use of construction equipment or vehicles that would generate vibration. Similarly, the Project does not

involve new operational/maintenance activities beyond existing conditions that would result in new sources of vibration during operations. As such, the Project would not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. No impact would occur.

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?

No impact. The closest airport to the Project facilities is Palmdale Regional Airport, located approximately 8.5 miles to the north. The Project facilities are not located within the airport influence area or mapped noise contours of Palmdale Regional Airport (Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission 2003). In addition, the Project would not introduce new people to the area that could be subject to aircraft noise. As such, the Project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. No impact would occur.

XIV. Population and Housing

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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)?

No impact. The Project does not propose new homes or businesses and would therefore not directly induce population growth. The water diverted for the Project would be recharged to help provide a buffer against hydrologic variability in California; it is not intended to provide a new source of water to support new population growth. As such, the Project would not indirectly induce population growth. No impact would occur.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements and would therefore not have the potential to directly displace people or housing. Discharged flows into Littlerock Creek would be contained within the existing channel and would not have the potential to result in flooding and the subsequent displacement of housing or people downstream. No impact would occur.

XV. Public Services

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:				
a) Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Fire protection?

b) Police protection?

c) Schools?

d) Parks?

e) Other public facilities?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements, changes in operational/maintenance activities, or population growth and would therefore not require fire protection or police protection or result in the use of schools, parks, or other public facilities. As such, the provision of new or altered facilities would not be necessary, and no impact would occur.

XVI. Recreation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) 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?

No impact. The Project would not result in population growth and would therefore not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. As such, no impact would occur.

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?

No impact. The Project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. As such, no impact would occur.

XVII. Transportation

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

a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements or changes in operational/maintenance activities and would therefore not require construction within roadways or generate vehicular traffic along roadways. As such, the Project would not have the potential to conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. No impact would occur.

b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements or changes in operational/maintenance activities and would therefore not generate vehicular traffic. As such, the Project would not have the potential to conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). No impact would occur.

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements or changes in operational/maintenance activities and would therefore not have the potential to increase hazards due to a geometric design features or incompatible uses. No impact would occur.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements or changes in operational/maintenance activities and would therefore not require construction within roadways or generate vehicular traffic along roadways that could impede emergency access. No impact would occur.

XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) 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	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) 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)?

ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements or other ground-disturbing activities that would have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource. No impact would occur.

XIX. Utilities and Service Systems

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of 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?

No impact. The Project would utilize existing water conveyance infrastructure. It would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. As such, no impact would occur.

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Less than significant impact. The Project entails the recharge of water when there is surplus SWP water available. Water supplies are thus inherently sufficient when the Project is operating. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

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?

No impact. The Project would not generate wastewater. No impact would occur.

d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements or changes in operational/maintenance activities and would therefore not generate solid waste. No impact would occur.

e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No impact. As indicated above in Item XIX(e), the Project would not generate solid waste; therefore, it would not conflict with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. No impact would occur.

XX. Wildfire

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements or changes in operational/maintenance activities that could affect roadways; therefore, the Project would not have the potential to impair implementation an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impact would occur.

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements or changes in operational/maintenance activities and would therefore not have the potential to exacerbate wildfire risks. In addition, the Project would not introduce new occupants that could be exposed to pollutants concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. No impact would occur.

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?

No impact. The Project would utilize existing water conveyance infrastructure. It does not involve physical improvements or changes in operational/maintenance activities, such as the installation or maintenance of infrastructure, which could exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. No impact would occur.

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?

Less than significant impact. The Project would not introduce new people or structures that could be exposed to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. While the Project would increase flows within Littlerock Creek, the Project would not exacerbate flooding risks to existing people or structures downstream since the existing creek channel would be able to accommodate both Project and non-Project flows. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of past, present and probable future projects)	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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?

No impact. The Project does not involve physical improvements and would therefore not 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. In addition, the flows within Littlerock Creek associated with the Project's discharges would not result in habitat modifications or otherwise adversely affect biological resources. No impact would occur.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of past, present and probable future projects)?

No impact. Since the Project does not involve physical improvements or changes in operational/maintenance activities from existing conditions, it would not have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

No impact. The Project does not physical improvements and would not result in significant environmental effects, including those which could cause a substantial adverse effect on human beings. No impact would occur.

3.0 REFERENCES

California Department of Conservation. 2022. California Important Farmland Finder. Available at: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/. Accessed August 14, 2024.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2024. Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer. Available at: https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/what-we-do/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/fire-hazard-severity-zones/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps. Access August 15, 2024.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2024. EnviroStor. Available at: https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/. Accessed August 15, 2024.

Conservation Biology Institute. 2024. Data Basin: Mojavean Semi-Desert Wash Scrub - Natural Community Distribution, DRECP. Available at: https://databasin.org/maps/new/#datasets=2b258a8338bb47b18a604c77de92581a. Accessed August 2024.

Kennedy Jenks. 2019. Watermaster Application for Storage Agreement for Banking and Recovery. July 8.

Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission. 2003. Palmdale Airport/USAF Plant 42 Airport Influence Area. Available at: https://case.planning.lacounty.gov/aluc/airports. Access August 15, 2024.

State Water Resources Control Board. 2024. GeoTracker. Available at: https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/. Accessed August 15, 2024.

4.0 PREPARERS

Hunter Stapp, Project Manager

Vanessa Toscano, Quality Assurance Reviewer