



COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT

City of Lancaster Initial Study

-
1. **Project Title and File Number:** Tentative Tract Map No. 22-07 (53256)
 2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Lancaster
Community Development Department
44933 Fern Avenue
Lancaster, California 93534
 3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Kendall Brekke, Senior Planner
City of Lancaster
Community Development Department
(661) 723-6100
 4. **Project Location:** ±40.3 gross acres on the northwest corner of
35th Street East and Avenue K
(Assessor's Parcel Number: 3150-014-008)
(see Figure 1)
 5. **Applicant Name and Address:** Daryoush Dayan
3470 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1020
Los Angeles, CA 90010
 6. **General Plan Designation:** Urban Residential (UR)
 7. **Zoning Designation:** Urban Residential, Low Density (R-7,000)
 8. **Description of Project:**

The proposed project consists of a 150-lot single-family residential subdivision on approximately 40.3 gross acres on the northwest corner of 35th Street East and Avenue K. The lots would range in size from 7,000 square feet to 14,549 square feet. Access to the subdivision would be provided from 35th Street East and 32nd Street West. The streets within the subdivision would be private and the streets surrounding the subdivision would remain public.



Figure 1, Project Location Map

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The project site is vacant. The properties south, east, and west of the project site are occupied by existing single-family residences. The property to the north is occupied by a high school.

In a wider context, the subject area is bordered by urban residential to the west and rural residential to the east, comprised of single-family subdivisions which were built at dates ranging back to approximately 1986. Eastside High School borders the site to the north. Enterprise Elementary School is located approximately 0.5 miles to the northeast, and Columbia Elementary School is located approximately 0.6 miles to the northwest. Table 1 provides the zoning and land uses immediately surrounding the subject site.

**Table 1
Zoning/Land Use Information**

Direction	Zoning	Land Use
North	Public (P)	School
East	Rural Residential 1 (RR-1)	Single-Family Residential
South	Urban Residential, Low Density (R-7,000)	Single-Family Residential
West	Urban Residential, Low Density (R-7,000)	Single-Family Residential

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement) for the proposed project include, but are not limited to, the following:

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District
- Southern California Edison
- Los Angeles County Sanitation District #14
- Los Angeles County Waterworks District #40
- Los Angeles County Fire Department

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, consultation letters for the proposed project were sent to three individuals associated with three tribes which have requested to be included. These letters were mailed via certified return receipt mail and included copies of the site plan and cultural resources report. Table 2 identifies the tribes, the person to whom the letter was directed, and the date the letter was received.

The Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation and the Fernandeano Tataviam Band of Mission Indians responded to the letters and their requested mitigation measures have been included in the cultural resources section to address proper procedures in the event of that previously unknown cultural resources are discovered on the project site during construction.

**Table 2
Tribal Notification**

Tribe	Person/Title	Date Received
Fernandeano Tataviam Band of Mission Indians	Jairo Avila – Tribal Historic and Cultural Preservation Officer	May 9, 2022
Fernandeano Tataviam Band of Mission Indians	Rudy Ortega – Tribal President	May 9, 2022
Gabrielesno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation	Andrew Salas – Chairman	May 9, 2022
Morongo Band of Mission Indians	Robert Martin – Chairperson	May 9, 2022
Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation	Jill McCormick – Historic Preservation Officer	May 9, 2022
Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation	Jessica Mauck – Director of Cultural Resources	May 9, 2022

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.



 Kendall Brekke, Senior Planner

May 13, 2025

 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 the immediately surrounding area (LMEA Figure 12.0-1). Views of these scenic areas are not generally visible from the project site or the immediately surrounding roadways. The proposed project would consist of the subdivision of 150 single-family residential lots and would be similar to the existing single-family homes surrounding the project site. With implementation of the proposed project, the views would not change because the construction of the project would have similar heights to the existing homes. Therefore, no impact would occur.
- b. The project site is not located along any designated State Scenic Highways. There are no State designated scenic routes or highways within the City of Lancaster. Additionally, there are no rock outcroppings or buildings on the project site. Roadways designated by the City’s Master Environmental Assessment as a local scenic roadway are not within the vicinity of the subject site. One ornamental tree is present on the property but will be removed from the site as part of the proposed project. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.
- c. The proposed project is consistent with the zoning code and the General Plan as it pertains to this use and zone. The City’s Design Guidelines provide the basis to achieve quality design for all development within the city. Development of the proposed project would change the visual character of the subject site from vacant land to a residential subdivision of 150 lots. The new development would conform to design standards for subdivisions, the intent of the design guidelines, and would be compatible with nearby developments. Prior to the issuance of building permits for the project, the elevations of the

houses would be subject to review by the Community Development Director to ensure that the elevations are consistent with the design guidelines, the city's recently adopted Objective Design Standards, and the city's vision for the look of the community. Therefore, the impacts would be less than significant.

- d. Currently, no light is generated on the project site. Light generated in the area is primarily from residential lighting, vehicle headlights, and streetlights. The light generated from the project site would be in the form of motor vehicles, streetlights, and residential lighting. The proposed streetlights within the development would be shielded and focused downward onto the project site. Additionally, the proposed development would not produce substantial amounts of glare as the development would be constructed primarily from non-reflective materials. Therefore, the impacts would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>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:</p>				
<p>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?</p>				X
<p>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>				X
<p>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))?</p>				X
<p>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>				X
<p>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?</p>				X

- a. The California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) tracks and categorizes land with respect to agricultural resources. Land is designated as one of the following and each has a specific definition: Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance, Grazing Land, Urban and Built-Up Land, and Other Land.

The latest available map for Los Angeles County is dated 2018. According to the 2018 map, the project site is designated as Other Land. Other Land is defined as land “not included in any other mapping category. Common examples include low density rural developments; brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing; confined livestock, poultry, or aquaculture facilities; strip mines, borrow pits; and water bodies smaller than 40 acres. Vacant and nonagricultural land surrounded on all sides by urban development and greater than 40 acres is mapped as Other Land.”

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 zoned Urban Residential, Low Density (R-7,000). This designation does not allow for agricultural uses. Additionally, the project site and the 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 project site is designated as Urban Residential (UR) and zoned R-7,000. Single-family homes are a permitted use under this zone. As such, any emissions associated with the proposed project have already been accounted for and the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan and no impacts would occur.
- b. The project site is within the boundary of the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) and therefore, is subject to compliance with the thresholds established by the AVAQMD. These thresholds were provided in the AVAQMD’s “California Environmental Quality Act and Federal Conformity Guidelines” document, dated August 2016. The thresholds have been summarized below in Table 3.

Table 3
AVAQMD Air Quality Thresholds

Criteria Pollutant	Daily Threshold (Pounds)	Annual Threshold (Tons)
Greenhouse Gases (CO ₂ e)	100,000	548,000
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	100	548
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)	25	137
Oxides of Sulfur (SO _x)	25	137
Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	15	82
Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	12	65
Hydrogen Sulfide (H ₂ S)	10	54
Lead (Pb)	0.6	3

Construction of the proposed project would generate air emissions associated with grading, use of heavy equipment, construction vehicles, etc. However, the emissions are not anticipated to exceed the established thresholds identified above due to the size and the type of proposed project.

The proposed project would generate approximately 1,415 daily vehicle trips as determined by the City Traffic Engineer. These trips would generate air emissions; however, the amount of emissions from the estimated vehicle trips would not be sufficient to create or significantly contribute towards violations of air quality standards. Therefore, emissions associated with the occupancy of the proposed subdivision would be less than significant.

- c. The nearest sensitive receptors are single family residences surrounding the project site. As discussed in Item III.b, the project would generate air emissions during both construction and operation. However, these air emissions would not exceed the thresholds established by the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) nor would the traffic generated by the proposed project significantly impact nearby roadways or intersections. As such, the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

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

Nearby sensitive receptors as well as workers at the project site could be exposed to Valley Fever from fugitive dust generated during construction. There is the potential that cocci spores would be stirred up during excavation, grading, and earth-moving activities, exposing construction workers and nearby

sensitive receptors to these spores and thereby to the potential of contracting Valley Fever. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure 11 (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. a. 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 come to the site for various stages of construction; however, all construction personnel shall be provided training prior to beginning work. The evidence submitted to the Community Development Director regarding the "Valley Fever Training Handout" and session(s) shall include the following:
 1. A sign-in sheet (to include the printed employee names, signature, and date) for all employees who attended the training session.
 2. Distribution of a written flier or brochure that includes educational information regarding the health effects of exposure to criteria pollutant emissions and Valley Fever.
 3. Training on methods that may help prevent Valley Fever infection.
 4. 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.
- b. 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:
 1. 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.
 2. Provide communication methods, such as two-way radios, for use in enclosed cabs.

3. 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.
 4. 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).
 5. Provide separate, clean eating areas with hand-washing facilities.
 6. 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.
 7. Train workers to recognize the symptoms of Valley Fever, and to promptly report suspected symptoms of work-related Valley Fever to a supervisor.
 8. Work with a medical professional to develop a protocol to medically evaluate employees who develop symptoms of Valley Fever.
- c. 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 Community Development 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 Community Development Director. The radius shall not exceed three miles and is dependent upon the location of the project site.
1. When possible, position workers upwind or crosswind when digging a trench or performing other soil-disturbing tasks.
 2. Prohibit smoking at the worksite outside of designated smoking areas; designated smoking areas will be equipped with handwashing facilities.
 3. Post warnings on-site and consider limiting access to visitors, especially those without adequate training and respiratory protection.
 4. Audit and enforce compliance with relevant Cal OSHA health and safety standards on the job site.
- d. Construction 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 produced by vehicles traveling along Avenue K and 35th Street West. Most objectionable odors are typically associated with industrial projects involving the use of chemicals, solvents, petroleum products and other strong-smelling elements used in manufacturing processes, as well as sewage treatment facilities and landfills. These types of uses are not part of the proposed project. Odors may be generated by typical residential activities (e.g. cooking, etc.). However, these odors are considered to be normal odors associated with residential developments and are less than significant. Therefore, impacts associated with the odors 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 for the project site by Mark Hagan, Wildlife Biologist, and documented in a report entitled “Biological Resource Assessment of APN 3150-014-008 Lancaster, California” and dated April 2022.

A survey of the project site was conducted on March 23, 2022. Plant species and animal species identified in the report are listed in Tables 4 and 5.

No desert tortoises were observed during the field survey, and the site did not contain suitable habitat to support desert tortoises. The site did not contain suitable habitat to support Mohave ground squirrels. No burrowing owls were observed during the field survey, however potential future cover sites for burrowing owls were present within the site. The few trees within the study area may provide suitable nesting habitat for smaller migratory birds. Swainson’s hawk and other raptors would not nest within the study area given the lack of suitable nesting sites for them. The site appears to have no forage value for Swainson’s hawks given the condition and location. No sensitive plants, specifically Joshua tree, alkali mariposa lily, desert cymopterus, and Barstow woolly sunflower, were observed during the field survey. No other sensitive plants are expected to occur within the study area due to the lack of suitable habitat. No other state or federally listed species are expected to occur within the proposed project area. As such, mitigation measures have been included requiring a pre-construction survey to confirm that burrowing owls and any bird/raptor nests are absent prior to the start of construction activities. With incorporation of the required mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

**Table 4
Observed Plant Species**

Common Name	Scientific Name
Cheatgrass	<i>Bromus tectorum</i>
Comb-bur	<i>Pectocarya recurvata</i>
Fiddleneck	<i>Amsinckia tessellata</i>
Foxtail barley	<i>Hordeum leporinum</i>
Goldfields	<i>Lasthenia californica</i>
Mustard sp.	Family: Brassicaceae
Nightshade sp.	Family: Solanaceae
Ornamental tree	
Rabbit brush	<i>Chrysothamnus nauseosis</i>
Red stemmed filaree	<i>Erodium cicutarium</i>
Russian thistle	<i>Salsola iberica</i>
Salt cedar	<i>Tamarix sp.</i>
Schismus	<i>Schismus sp.</i>
Tansy mustard	<i>Descurainia sophia</i>
Tumble mustard	<i>Sisymbrium altissimum</i>

**Table 5
Observed Animal Species**

Common Name	Scientific Name
Rodents	Order: Rodentia
Kangaroo rat	<i>Dipodomys sp.</i>
California ground squirrel	<i>Citellus beecheyi</i>
Desert cottontail	<i>Sylvilagus auduboni</i>
Domestic dog	<i>Canis familiaris</i>
Side blotched lizard	<i>Uta stansburiana</i>
Mallard	<i>Anas platyrhynchos</i>

Killdeer	<i>Charadrius vociferus</i>
Mourning dove	<i>Zenaida macroura</i>
Rock dove	<i>Columba livia</i>
Back-chinned hummingbird	<i>Archilochus alexandri</i>
Barn swallow	<i>Hirundo rustica</i>
Common raven	<i>Corvus corax</i>
Black phoebe	<i>Sayornis nigricans</i>
Sparrow sp.	Family: Emberizidae
Harvester ants	Order: Hymenoptera
Spider	Order: Araneida

Mitigation Measures

2. A pre-construction survey for burrowing owl shall be required to determine the presence or absence of this species on the project site prior to any vegetation removal or ground disturbing activities. The pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist in accordance with the methods outline in the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (2012). Burrowing owl protocol surveys shall be conducted on the project site and within 500 feet of the project site where there is suitable habitat. In California, the burrowing owl breeding season extends from February 1 to August 31 with some variances by geographic location and climatic conditions. Survey protocol for breeding season owl surveys states to conduct four survey visits: 1) at least one site visit between February 15 and April 15, and 2) a minimum of three survey visits, at least three weeks apart, between April 15 and July 15, with at least one visit after June 15. Documentation of the surveys and findings shall be submitted to the City of Lancaster for review.

If burrowing owls are observed on the project site during surveys, the project proponent shall coordinate with CDFW and obtain appropriate take authorization. The project proponent shall comply with the mitigation measures detailed in the take authorization issued by CDFW. The project proponent shall provide a copy of a fully executed take authorization to the City prior to implementing ground-disturbing activities and vegetation removal.

3. If construction activities are initiated during the nesting season for birds/raptors (i.e., February 15 to September 15, as early as January 1 for some raptors), a pre-construction survey for active bird/raptor nests will be required within three days prior to the initiation of construction activities. If project activities are delayed or suspended for more than 7 days during the nesting season, the nesting bird and raptor survey shall be repeated. If an active nest is located during pre-construction surveys or at any point during the construction phase of the project, the species shall be identified, and a no-disturbance buffer shall be established around the active nest. At a minimum, a no-disturbance buffer of 500 feet shall be placed around an active raptor nest, and a no-disturbance buffer of 100 feet shall be placed around an active migratory bird nest. Personnel working on the project, including all contractors working onsite, shall be instructed on the presence of nesting birds, restricted areas, and adherence to no disturbance buffers. Once the young have fledged and left the nest, or the nest otherwise becomes inactive under natural conditions, project activities within the “no-disturbance” buffer may occur following an additional survey by the qualified biologist to search for any new bird nests in the restricted area.

- b. There is no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community located on the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- c. There are no state or federally protected wetlands on the project site as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- d. The project site is not part of an established migratory wildlife corridor. 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 resource survey was conducted for the project site by Hudlow Cultural Resource Associates and documented in a report entitled “A Phase I Cultural Resource Survey, Avenue K and 35th Street East, City of Lancaster, California” and dated March 2022. The cultural report included both a records search and a pedestrian survey of the project site.

On January 24, 2022, a pedestrian survey of the project site was conducted by walking north-south transects at 15-meter intervals. Additionally, a records search for the project site and vicinity was conducted at the Southern Central Coast Information Center on March 3, 2022. There have been 12 cultural resource surveys conducted within one-half mile of the project site with two including the project site. Three archaeological sites have been recorded within one-half mile of the current project area, comprised of a historic house site, and two historic trash scatters. No human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, were identified on the project site.

Two cultural resources were identified: an agricultural pond at the southeast corner of the property, which was found to be “dry and covered in construction debris”; and the remains of a homestead on the southwest side of the property, including a deteriorated concrete walkway and the remains of a fence. As a result of the accumulated construction debris and lack of historic integrity, the agricultural pond is not found eligible for nomination to the California Register of Historic Resources under Criteria 1-4. As a result of evident looting and deterioration as a result of both the environment and human intervention, the homestead remains are also not found eligible for nomination to the California Register of Historic Resources under Criteria 1-4.

It is possible that previously unknown resources could be encountered during the course of construction-related activities. Additionally, tribes contacted during the AB 52 process requested that mitigation measures be included as part of the project to ensure the proper handling and treatment of any cultural resources encountered on the project site. These measures have been included and are identified below. With incorporation of these measures, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

4. 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 Secretary of Interior standards shall be hired to assess the find. Work on the other portions of the project outside of the buffered area may continue during this assessment period. Additionally, the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation Cultural Resources Department (YSMN) shall be contacted, as detailed within Mitigation Measure 6, regarding any pre-contact and/or historic-era finds and be provided 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.
5. If significant pre-contact and/or historic-era 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 YSMN for review and comment, as detailed within Mitigation Measure 6. The archaeologist shall monitor the remainder of the project and implement the Plan accordingly.
6. 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 §7050.5 and that code enforced for the duration of the project.
7. The Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation Cultural Resources Department (YSMN) shall be contacted, as detailed in Mitigation Measure 3, of any pre-contact and/or historic-era cultural resources discovered during project implementation, and be provided information regarding the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment. Should the find be deemed significant, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), a cultural resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan shall be created by the archaeologist, in coordination with YSMN, and all subsequent finds shall be subject to this Plan. This Plan shall allow for a monitor to be present that represents YSMN for the remainder of the project, should YSMN elect to place a monitor on-site.
8. Any and all archaeological/cultural documents created as a part of the project (isolate records, site records, survey reports, testing reports, etc.) shall be supplied to the applicant and Lead Agency for dissemination to YSMN. The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with YSMN throughout the life of the project.
9. 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 Secretary of Interior standards shall assess the find. Work on the portions of the Projects outside of the buffered area may continue during this assessment period. The Fernandeano Tataviam Band of Mission Indians (FTBMI) shall be contacted regarding any pre-contact and/or post-contact finds and be provided information after the archaeologist makes their initial assessment of the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment.
10. Should the find be deemed significant, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), the Project applicant shall retain a professional Native American monitor procured by the FTBMI to observe all remaining ground-disturbing activities including, but not limited to, excavating, digging, trenching, plowing, drilling, tunneling, quarrying, grading, leveling, clearing, driving posts, auguring, blasting, stripping topsoil or similar activity, and archaeological work.

11. The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with the FTBMI on the disposition and treatment of any Tribal Cultural Resource encountered during all ground disturbing activities.

	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 reduction 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 provides, 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 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. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

The California Green Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11), commonly referred to as the CALGreen Code, is a statewide mandatory construction code that was developed and adopted by the California Building Standards Commission and the California Department of Housing and Community Development. CALGreen standards require new residential and commercial buildings to comply with mandatory measures under five topical areas: planning and design; energy efficiency; water efficiency and conservation; material conservation and resource efficiency; and environmental quality. An updated version of both the California Building Code and the CalGreen Code went into effect on January 1, 2023.

In 2014, the City of 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.

Therefore, no impacts would occur.

	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 render 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 the 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 April 2019, the California Geologic Survey updated the Seismic Hazard Zones Map for Lancaster (SSHZ) (<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>). 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 low 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 mitigation measure listed below is required to control dust/wind erosion. With implementation of the mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

- 12. The applicant shall submit the required Construction Excavation Fee to the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) prior to the issuance of any grading and/or construction permits. This includes compliance with all prerequisites outlined in District Rule 403, Fugitive Dust, including submission and approval of a Dust Control Plan, installation of signage and the completion of a successful onsite compliance inspection by an AVAQMD field inspector. Proof of compliance shall be submitted to the city.
- 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 result 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 of subject to sinkholes, subsidence (LMEA Figure 2-3) or any other form of soil instability. The closest fissures/sinkholes are located approximately 5.5 miles northwest of the project site near Lancaster Boulevard and 25th Street West. The proposed project would be required to have a geotechnical study prepared and all recommendations followed as part of the building permit process. These recommendations would ensure that any impacts associated with forms of soil instability would be less than significant. For a discussion of potential impacts regarding liquefaction, please refer to Item VII.a.
- d. The soil on the project site is characterized by a low shrink/swell potential (LMEA Figure 2-3), which is not an expansive soil as defined by Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code. A soils report on the soils within the project site shall be submitted to the city by the project developer prior to grading the property and the recommendations of the report shall be incorporated into the development of the property. 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 wastewater disposal are part of the proposed project. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

- f. The proposed project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or geologic feature. 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. The proposed project consists of a 150-lot residential subdivision. As discussed in Item III.b., the proposed project would generate air emissions during construction and operational activities, some of which may be greenhouse gases. These emissions are anticipated to be less than the thresholds established by AVAQMD due to the size of the project and therefore would not prevent the State from reaching its greenhouse gas reduction targets. Once the development is operational, it would generate emissions, primarily from vehicles and other activities associated with the industrial uses, including landscape maintenance, heating/cooling maintenance, etc. However, the development would be required to comply with the requirements of the City's Net Zero Energy Ordinance, Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance, and other requirements which increase the efficiency of buildings and reduce air emissions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

a-b. The proposed project consists of a 150-lot residential subdivision. Typical construction materials would be utilized during the development of the proposed project. The local roadways surrounding the project site have not been designated for hazardous materials transportation. The Antelope Valley Freeway is designated as a hazardous materials transportation corridor (LMEA p. 9.1-14 and Figure 9.1-4); however, it is located approximately 4.6 miles west of the project site. All project operations would be in

accordance with application regulations. Development of the project site would not involve the demolition of any structures and therefore would not expose individuals or the environment to asbestos containing materials or lead-based paint. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c. The project site is located adjacent to an existing school, Eastside High School, at 3200 East Avenue J-8. However, the proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous/acute hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- d. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for the project site by Andersen Integrated Services. The results of the study are documented in a report entitled "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment" and dated February 10, 2022.

A survey of the project site was conducted on January 24, 2022 to determine the presence of any recognized environmental concerns. No structures were observed, nor was evidence of dumping. Minor amounts of wood and concrete debris were observed throughout the site. A depression was observed in the soil in the southeast corner of the site. A concrete feature with a pipe attached going below ground was observed in the southwest portion of the site. No evidence of staining, releases or olfactory indications of a release were identified. No evidence of environmental concerns, including hazardous material disposal, sewage, discharge, wells, septic systems, underground or above ground (UST/AST) storage tanks, or stressed vegetation, were observed on the subject site.

In addition to the survey of the project site, a radial database search was conducted for the project site and immediately surrounding properties within the specified search distances by Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR). The Eastside High School site immediately north of the project site was identified as having been involved in a standard school investigation, which determined that no contaminants were found, and no further action was needed in November of 2001. No other sites were identified as posing a potential threat within the specified search distances in the radial database report and no impacts would occur.

- e. The project site is not located within the boundaries of an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- f. The traffic generated by the proposed project is not expected to block the existing or proposed roadways, and improvements which 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. No impacts would occur.
- g. The surrounding properties are a school and numerous single-family residences. It is possible that these lands could be subject to grass and building fires. The project site is within the service boundaries of Los Angeles County Fire Station No. 135, located at 1846 East Avenue K, 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 project site is not located in the immediate vicinity of an open body of water or in an aquifer recharge area. The proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable provisions of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. The NPDES program establishes a comprehensive storm water quality program to manage urban storm water and minimize pollution of the environment to the maximum extent practicable. The reduction of pollutants in urban storm water

discharge through the use of structural and nonstructural Best Management Practices (BMPs) is one of the primary objectives of the water quality regulations. BMPs that are typically used to manage 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 Public Works Department. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed project consists of the construction of 150 single-family residential lots. Single family residences are not a use that would normally generate wastewater that violates water quality standards or exceeds waste discharge requirements. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- b. The proposed project would not include any groundwater wells or pumping activities. All water supplied to the proposed project would be obtained from Los Angeles County Waterworks, District 40. Therefore, 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 paving of the parking areas and the construction of the building. 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.

The project site is designated as Flood Zone X per the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Flood Zone X is outside of both the 100-year and 500-year flood zones. Therefore, impacts 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 large bodies of water. Additionally, the project site would not be subject to mudflows. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- e. The proposed project would not conflict with 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. Therefore, 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 occupancy of a 150-lot residential subdivision. The project site is located on the northwest corner of 35th Street East and Avenue K on vacant land. The proposed project would not block a public street, trail, 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 current mining or recover 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 designated as Mineral Reserve Zone 1 (contains no resources). Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources would occur.

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

- a. The City’s General Plan (Table 3-1) establishes an outdoor maximum CNEL of 65 dBA for residential uses. Table 8-11 of the LMEA provides the existing roadway noise levels adjacent to the project site. The current noise level along Avenue K between 30th Street East and 35th Street East is 60.8 dBA. While this noise level is consistent with the standards of the General Plan, additional features of the proposed project (e.g., landscaping, block walls, etc.) would ensure that the project remains in compliance with the General Plan. Therefore, potential noise impacts associated with traffic from the proposed development and operational activities would be less than significant.

Construction activities associated with earth-moving equipment and other construction machinery would temporarily increase noise levels for adjacent land uses. Noise sensitive receptors are located near the project site and construction noise would likely be audible at these locations. However, all construction activities would occur in accordance with the city’s noise ordinance with respect to days of the week and time of day and mitigation measures have been identified to reduce the noise generated by construction activities to the extent feasible. With incorporation of these measures, construction noise would still be audible but would not exceed established standards and 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 the periods and days permitted by local ordinance.

14. The on-site construction supervisor shall have the responsibility and authority to receive and resolve 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
- b. It is not anticipated that the grading of the proposed project would require the use of machinery that generates ground-borne vibration as no major subsurface construction (e.g., parking garage) is planned. No ground mounted industrial-type equipment that generates ground vibration would be utilized once the project is constructed and operational. Therefore, no impacts associated with ground-borne vibration/noise are anticipated.
 - 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 would result in an incremental increase in population growth; however, this increase was anticipated in both the City’s General Plan and in the Southern California Council of Governments’ (SCAG) most recent Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). 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 would increase the need for fire and police services; however, the project site is within the current service area of both these agencies and the additional time and cost to service the site is minimal. The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth and therefore, would not substantially increase the demand on parks, schools, or other public facilities. Additionally, this growth has been accounted for in the City’s General Plan and within SCAG’s population forecasts. Impacts would be less than significant.

Construction of the proposed project may result in an incremental increase in population and may increase the number of students in the Eastside Union School District and the Antelope Valley Union High School District. Proposition IA, 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 applicant would be required to pay park fees which would offset the impact to 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 would not conflict with or impede any of the General Plan policies or specific actions related to alternative modes of transportation (Lancaster General Plan pgs. 5-18 to 5-24.) Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- b. In July 2020, the City of Lancaster adopted standards and thresholds for analyzing projects with respect to vehicle miles traveled (VMT). A series of screening criteria were adopted and if a project meets one of these criteria, a VMT analysis is not required. These criteria are: 1) project site - generates fewer than 110 trips per day; 2) locally serving retail - commercial developments of 50,000 square feet or smaller; 3) project located in a low VMT area - 15% below baseline; 4) transit proximity; 5) affordable housing; and 6) transportation facilities.

The proposed project does not qualify for any of the screening criteria and as such, a project specific VMT study was prepared by Fehr & Peers and documented in a report entitled “Lancaster TTM 53256 VMT Analysis” and dated June 5, 2024.

This analysis determined that the proposed project needs to reduce its VMT by 263 in order to be 15% below the City’s thresholds. However, on January 24, 2023, the City of Lancaster City Council adopted the Vehicle Miles Traveled Impact Fee Mitigation Program and certified the accompanying Final Program Environmental Impact Report, Findings, and Statement of Overriding Considerations. The VMT mitigation program allows developers to pay \$150 per VMT to mitigate their VMT impacts and tier off of the Program EIR. The fee associated with the total 263 VMT reduction needed is \$39,450. With payment of the fee, the proposed project’s VMT impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

20. The proposed project shall pay \$39,450 to mitigate its VMT impacts in accordance with the City's Vehicle Miles Traveled Impact Fee Mitigation Program approved by the City Council on January 24, 2023.
- 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. The project site would have adequate emergency access to Avenue K and 35th Street East. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

- a. No specific tribal cultural resources have been identified either through the sacred lands file search conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission or by any of the Native American tribes with cultural affiliations to the area. Mitigation measures have been requested by the tribes to identify procedures and proper handling of any cultural resources which may be discovered during the course of construction. These mitigation measures have been included in the cultural resources section of this initial study. As such, no impacts would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. <u>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</u> . 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 to the existing utilities such as electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, telecommunications, etc. These services already exist in the vicinity of the project site. Connections would occur on the project site or within existing roadways or rights-of-way. 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 project site is located within the jurisdictional boundaries of District No. 14. All wastewaters would be treated at the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant which has a design capacity of 18 million gallons per day (mgd) and currently produces an average recycled water flow of 14.6 mgd. All wastewater flow

originating from the proposed project will discharge to a local sewer line, which is not maintained by the Districts, for conveyance to the Districts' Trunk C Trunk Sewer, located in 30th Street East at Avenue K. The Districts' 24-inch diameter lined trunk sewer has a capacity of 5.4 mgd and conveyed a peak flow of 0.8 mgd when last measured in 2018. The proposed project would generate an expected 39,000 gallons of wastewater per day. The proposed project would not require the expansion of existing facilities or the construction of new facilities. 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 required 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 comply 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 project's contribution would be minimal. However, the existing landfill has capacity to handle the waste generated by the proposed project. Additionally, the proposed project would comply 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. <u>WILDFIRE</u> . If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impact an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildlife risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				X
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				X
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				X

a. See Item IX.f.

b-d. The project 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 Fire Station No. 135 which would provide service in the event of a fire. Additionally, the proposed project would be constructed in accordance with all existing and applicable building and fire codes. Therefore, no impacts would occur as a result of wildfires.

	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 150 single-family residential lots in the R-7,000 zone. Other projects have been submitted and/or approved within approximately one mile of the project site (Table 6). These projects are also required to be in accordance with the City's zoning code and General Plan.

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.

The proposed project would not create any impacts with respect to: Agriculture & Forestry Resources, Energy, Land Use & Planning, Mineral Resources, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Wildfire. The project would create impacts to other resource areas and mitigation measures have been identified for Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology & Soils, Noise, and Transportation. 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. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Table 6
Related Projects List

Case No.	Location	APNs	Acres	Description	Status
TTM 61574	SWC 30 th St E and Ave K-4	3170-007-053	14	45-lot residential subdivision	Approved
TTM 61314	SEC of Ave K & 26 th St E	3170-007-056	29	84-lot residential subdivision	Approved
TTM 74101, CUP 16-09	SWC Ave K & 25 th St E	3170-006-005, 3170-006-038, 3170-006- 040 thru -042	21	85-lot residential subdivision with 172 total units (incl. ADUs)	Approved
TTM 63786	NWC 30 th St E & Ave J-8	3150-012-025, -026	9	36-lot residential subdivision	Approved
TTM23- 009 (83793)	NEC 26 th St E & Ave J-4	3150-030-013	2.5	26-lot residential subdivision	Under Review
TTM 83315	SEC 30 th St E & Nugent St	3150-028-005	25	103-lot residential subdivision	Approved
TTM 83590	NEC 35 th St E & Ave J	3150-028-001, -002	28	106-lot residential subdivision	Approved
TTM 63137	NWC of 40 th St E & Ave J	3150-029-025, -026	19	53-lot residential subdivision	Approved
TTM 61248	SWC 35 th St E & Ave J	3150-013-032, 3150-013-039	40	157-lot residential subdivision	Approved

List of Referenced Documents and Available Locations*:

BRR:	Biological Resource Assessment of APN 3150-014-008 Lancaster, California; Mark Hagan, Wildlife Biologist; April 5, 2022	CDD
CRS:	A Phase I Cultural Resource Survey, Avenue K and 35 th Street East, City of Lancaster, California; Scott M. Hudlow; March 2022	CDD
ESA:	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report; Andersen Integrated Services; February 10, 2022	CDD
FIRM:	Flood Insurance Rate Map	CDD
GPEIR:	Lancaster General Plan Environmental Impact Report	CDD
LACSD:	Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts letter; May 4, 2022	CDD
LGP:	Lancaster General Plan	CDD
LMC:	Lancaster Municipal Code	CDD
LMEA:	Lancaster Master Environmental Assessment	CDD
SSHZ:	State Seismic Hazard Zone Maps	CDD
USGS:	United States Geological Survey Maps	CDD
USDA SCS:	United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Maps	CDD
VMT:	Lancaster TTM 53256 VMT Analysis; Fehr & Peers; June 5, 2024	CDD

* CDD: Community Development Department
Lancaster City Hall
44933 Fern Avenue
Lancaster, California 93534