



COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT

City of Lancaster Initial Study

1. **Project title and File Number:** Site Plan Review No. 21-09
FedEx Ground Distribution Facility
2. **Lead agency name and address:** City of Lancaster
Development Services Department
Community Development Division
44933 Fern Avenue
Lancaster, California 93534
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Jocelyn Swain, Senior Planner
City of Lancaster
Development Services Department
(661) 723-6100
4. **Location:** ±40 acres at the northeast corner of 30th
Street West and Avenue G
(APNs: 3114-010-011)
5. **Applicant name and address:** D&D Engineering, Inc.
Attn: Henrik Nazarian
119 W Hyde Park Blvd
Inglewood, CA 90302
6. **General Plan designation:** Specific Plan (SP)
7. **Zoning:** Specific Plan No. 95-02 (Fox Field Specific
Plan)
8. **Description of project:**

The proposed project consists of the construction and operation of a FedEx Ground distribution facility on approximately 40 acres at the northeast corner of 30th Street and Avenue G. The main building would be 250,955 square feet and contains the warehouse facility and the administrative offices. Loading docks are located along the southern and eastern portions of the building. A 3,741 square foot vehicle maintenance building is proposed along the northeastern portion of the project site and would be used to perform basic maintenance on the FedEx ground fleet.

Access to the project site would be from two driveways along 30th Street West. The main parking lot is located on the western side of the project site and would provide a total of 486 parking spaces. Van, long trailer and tractor parking would be located on the north and south sides of the main building. Four drainage basins would be located on-site: along the Avenue G frontage, two small basins along 30th Street West, and one small basin in the northeast corner of the site.

Landscaping would be provided throughout the project site, with landscaping in the parking lot and enhanced landscaping located along Avenue G. The enhanced landscaping would be approximately 20 feet wide and include trees in order to screen the building from view. This landscaping would occur between the sidewalk along Avenue G and the drainage basin.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The project site is vacant and the properties surrounding the project site are vacant. Approximately 0.75 miles north of the project site are two single family residences and a small church (located along Avenue F). Half a mile to the south, are the Antelope Valley Fairgrounds and the Rite-Aid Distribution Facility. The Michaels Distribution facility is located approximately 0.5-0.75 miles to the southwest. The Fox Field Airfield and other industrial uses such as the Sygma Distribution Facility, the California National Guard Building are located between 1 and 1.5 miles to the west. The Apollo Community Regional Park is located approximately 0.75 miles northwest of the project site. The Antelope Valley Freeway (State Route 14) is located approximately 0.5 miles east of the project site with access to the freeway available from Avenue G. Table 1 provides the zoning and land uses immediately surrounding the project site.

**Table 1
Zoning/Land Use Information**

Direction	Zoning		Land Use
	City	County	
North	SP 95-02	N/A	Vacant
East	SP 95-02	M-1 (Light Manufacturing)	Vacant
South	SP 95-02	N/A	Vacant
West	SP 95-02	N/A	Vacant

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

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

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission

- 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, grading 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.

On March 30, 2022, the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians sent a response indicating that they have no issues with the project; however, the project site is located in a culturally sensitive area. They requested that mitigation measures be included in the event of discovery of previously unknown resources. These mitigation measures have been included in the cultural resources section. No other tribes have responded.

**Table 2
Tribal Notification**

Tribe	Person/Title	Date Received
Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation	Andrew Salas/Chairman	February 12, 2022
San Manuel Band of Mission Indians	Ryan Nordness/Cultural Resource Analyst	February 12, 2022
Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians	Jairo Avila, Tribal Historic and Cultural Preservation Officer	February 14, 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.


 Jocelyn Swain, Senior Planner

5/20/22
 Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

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

a. The City of Lancaster General Plan identifies five scenic areas in the City and immediately surrounding area (LMEA Figure 12.0-1). Views of these scenic areas are not generally visible from the project site or the immediately surrounding roadways. However, views of the open desert and the mountains surrounding the Antelope Valley are available from the project site and nearby roadways (Avenue G, 30th Street West, and 14 Freeway). The proposed project consists of the construction and operation of an approximately 250,000 square foot FedEx Ground Distribution facility. This distribution facility is similar in appearance to the other distribution facilities located with the Fox Field Specific Plan area including Michaels, Rite-Aid and Sygma. With implementation of the proposed project, the views would not change and would continue to be available from the roadways and project site. 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 trees, rock outcroppings or buildings on the project site. However, the Antelope Valley Freeway (Highway 14) is designated in the City’s Master Environmental Assessment as a local scenic roadway because of the views of the mountain ranges to the north and south of the valley. While the project site is near the freeway, the construction of the project would not impact the views available to the traveling motorists. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c. The proposed project is consistent with the zoning code and the Fox Field Specific Plan as it pertains to this use and zone. The specific plan identifies the requirements for the aesthetics of individual developments within the specific plan area. The requirements are supplemented by the City's Design Guidelines which were adopted on December 8, 2009 (and updated on March 30, 2010). These guidelines provide the basis to achieve quality design for all development within the City. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- d. The ambient lighting in the vicinity of the project site is low to moderate due to street lights; security and operational lighting from the nearby fairgrounds and distribution facilities; vehicle headlights, and lighting from aircraft utilizing the Fox Field airfield. Additional vehicle headlights from the Antelope Valley Freeway are also visible. Light and glare would be generated from the proposed project in the form of additional street lighting, parking lot/building security lighting and from motor vehicles associated with employees and FedEx vehicles. All lighting with the proposed 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, impacts would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. 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 maps for each county are updated every two years. The latest available map for Los Angeles County is from 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 Specific Plan (SP) No. 95-02 with an underlying zoning of Light Industrial. These designations do 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 Specific Plan (SP) and zoned Specific Plan (SP) No. 95-02 (Fox Field Specific Plan) with an underlying zoning of light industrial. Distribution facilities such as the one proposed are allowed under the Fox Field Specific Plan. 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. An air quality study was prepared for the proposed project by M. S. Hatch Consulting, LLC and documented in a report entitled “Air Quality Study – Fedex Ground Distribution Facility, Lancaster, CA” and dated November 10, 2021.

As part of this study the anticipated construction and operational air emissions were calculated and compared to the thresholds established by the air district. These thresholds are shown in Table 3. The air emission estimates were calculated using CalEEMod Version 2020.4.0. The inputs for the model were based on CalEEMod defaults and input provided by the engineer for the project. These inputs and the output of the model are contained as an appendix in the air quality report.

**Table 3
AVAQMD Air Quality Thresholds**

Criteria Pollutant	Daily Threshold (Pounds)	Annual Threshold (Tons)
Oxides of Nitrogen (NO _x)	137	100
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)	137	25
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	548	25
Oxides of Sulfur (SO _x)	137	25
Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	82	15
Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	65	12

Construction

The construction of the proposed project is anticipated to take approximately one year with the phases of construction broken down as follows: site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating. For each phase of construction, the types of equipment being utilized are identified in Table 4. This information was utilized in the air emissions model and the results for construction are contained in Table 5 for both daily emissions and annual emissions. This table shows that the construction emissions for the proposed project are less than the thresholds established by the air district and therefore, are less than significant.

**Table 4
Construction Equipment**

Construction Phase	Equipment	Number of Equipment	Hours per Day	Horsepower
Site Preparation	Rubber Tired Dozers	3	8	247
	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	4	8	97
Grading	Excavators	2	8	158
	Graders	1	8	187
	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8	247
	Scrapers	2	8	367
	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	8	97
Building Construction	Cranes	1	7	231
	Forklifts	3	8	89
	Generator Sets	1	8	84
	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	7	97
	Welders	1	8	46
Paving	Pavers	2	8	130
	Paving Equipment	2	8	132
	Rollers	2	8	80
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	6	78

**Table 5
 Estimated Construction Emissions**

Emissions Source	Total Emissions (tons per year)						
	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	CO _{2e}
Year 1 Emissions (2022)	0.33	2.49	3.06	0.01	0.60	0.24	803
Year 2 Emissions (2023)	0.89	1.05	1.66	<0.01	0.30	0.10	447
Total Construction Emissions							
Significant?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Total Emissions (pounds per day)						
	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	CO _{2e}
Year 1 Emissions (2022)	4.94	39.46	48.29	0.14	9.43	5.46	14,076
Year 2 Emissions (2023)	72.67	26.25	45.38	0.13	8.22	2.75	13,662
Total Construction Emissions							
Significant?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

Operation

The operational emissions consist of area sources, energy use, mobile sources, off-road equipment, solid waste disposal, water and wastewater use. The mobile sources were based on the number of trips (1,532 trips) identified in the Local Transportation Assessment conducted for the proposed project. Based on these calculations, the operational emissions (Table 6) associated with the proposed project would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

An assessment for Hazardous Air Pollutants was not conducted as there are no sensitive receptors within the specified distance of the project site as identified in the applicable air quality regulations.

- c. The properties immediately adjacent to the project site are vacant. There are no sensitive receptors in close proximity to the project site. The nearest sensitive receptors are two single family residences and a small church located approximately 0.75 miles to the north of the project site and Apollo Park which is located approximately 0.75 miles northwest of 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.

**Table 6
 Estimated Operational Emissions**

Emissions Source	Total Emissions (tons per year)						
	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	CO _{2e}
Area Sources	1.10	<0.01	0.01	0.00	<0.01	<0.01	<1
Energy	<0.01	0.01	0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	192
Mobile	0.39	3.89	5.22	0.03	1.87	0.54	2,894
Offroad (Electric Forklifts)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Waste	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.00	0.00	119
Water	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.00	0.00	257
Total Operational Emissions	1.49	3.90	5.24	0.03	1.87	0.54	3,463
Significant?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Total Emissions (pounds per day)						
	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	CO _{2e}
Area Sources	6.02	<0.01	0.09	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<1
Energy	0.01	0.06	0.05	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	70
Mobile	2.68	20.18	31.76	0.17	10.45	3.00	17,974
Offroad (Electric Forklifts)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Waste	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Water	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total Operational Emissions	8.70	20.24	31.90	0.17	10.45	3.00	18,045
Significant?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

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

Valley Fever is not contagious, and therefore, cannot be passed on from person to person. Most of those who are infected would recover without treatment within six months and would have a life-long immunity to the fungal spores. In severe cases, especially in those patients with rapid and extensive primary illness, those who are at risk for dissemination of disease, and those who have disseminated disease, antifungal drug therapy is used.

Nearby sensitive receptors as well as workers at the project site could be exposed to Valley Fever from fugitive dust generated during construction. There is the potential that cocci spores would be stirred up during excavation, grading, and earth-moving activities, exposing construction workers and nearby sensitive receptors to these spores and thereby to the potential of contracting Valley Fever. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures 12 and 13 (see Geology and Soils) which requires the project operator to implement dust control measures in

compliance with AVAQMD Rule 403, and implementation of Mitigation Measure 1, below, which would provide personal protective respiratory equipment to construction workers and provide information to all construction personnel and visitors about Valley Fever, the risk of exposure to Valley Fever would be minimized to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures

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

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

- Provide HEP-filters for heavy equipment equipped with factory enclosed cabs capable of accepting the filters. Cause contractors utilizing applicable heavy equipment to furnish proof of worker training on proper use of applicable heavy equipment cabs, such as turning on air conditioning prior to using the equipment.

- Provide communication methods, such as two-way radios, for use in enclosed cabs.
 - Require National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH)-approved half-face respirators equipped with minimum N-95 protection factor for use during worker collocation with surface disturbance activities, as required per the hazard assessment process.
 - Cause employees to be medically evaluated, fit-tested, and properly trained on the use of the respirators, and implement a full respiratory protection program in accordance with the applicable Cal/OSHA Respiratory Protection Standard (8 CCR 5144).
 - Provide separate, clean eating areas with hand-washing facilities.
 - Install equipment inspection stations at each construction equipment access/egress point. Examine construction vehicles and equipment for excess soil material and clean, as necessary, before equipment is moved off-site.
 - Train workers to recognize the symptoms of Valley Fever, and to promptly report suspected symptoms of work-related Valley Fever to a supervisor.
 - Work with a medical professional to develop a protocol to medically evaluate employees who develop symptoms of Valley Fever.
 - Work with a medical professional, in consultation with the Los Angeles County Public Health, to develop an educational handout for on-site workers and surrounding residents within three miles of the project site, and include the following information on Valley Fever: what are the potential sources/ causes, what are the common symptoms, what are the options or remedies available should someone be experiencing these symptoms, and where testing for exposure is available. Prior to construction permit issuance, this handout shall have been created by the project operator and reviewed by the project operator and reviewed by the Development Services Director. No less than 30 days prior to any work commencing, this handout shall be mailed to all existing residences within a specified radius of the project boundaries as determined by the Development Services Director. The radius shall not exceed three miles and is dependent upon the location of the project site.
 - When possible, position workers upwind or crosswind when digging a trench or performing other soil-disturbing tasks.
 - Prohibit smoking at the worksite outside of designated smoking areas; designated smoking areas will be equipped with handwashing facilities.
 - Post warnings on-site and consider limiting access to visitors, especially those without adequate training and respiratory protection.
 - Audit and enforce compliance with relevant Cal OSHA health and safety standards on the job site.
- d. Construction 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 G, 30th Street West, and the Antelope Valley Freeway (Highway 14). 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. The proposed project is a distribution facility for FedEx Ground. This type of use does not typically generate odor beyond any odors that a FedEx vehicle would generate. These odors are typical with this type of development and 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 and documented in a report entitled “Biological Resources Assessment of APN 3114-010-011, Lancaster, California” and dated October 25, 2021.

A survey of the project site was conducted on October 16, October 20, and October 21, 2021. A total of 36 pedestrian transects were walked in an east-west direction. During these surveys a

total of 36 plant species and 16 animal species were observed. These plant and animal species are listed in Tables 7 and 8, respectively.

**Table 7
Observed Plant Species**

Shadscale (<i>Atriplex confertifolia</i>)	Allscale (<i>Atriplex polycarpa</i>)	Peachthorn (<i>Lycium cooperi</i>)
Nevada saltbush (<i>Atriplex torreyi</i>)	Desert alyssum (<i>Lepidium fremontii</i>)	Alkali sacaton (<i>Sporobolus airoides</i>)
Silverscale (<i>Atriplex argentea</i>)	Inkweed (<i>Suaeda torreyana</i>)	Gilia (<i>Gilia minutiflora</i>)
Alkali pink (<i>Nitrophila occidentalis</i>)	Desert straw (<i>Stephanomeria pauciflora</i>)	Spotted buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum maculatum</i>)
Angle-stem buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum angulosum</i>)	Turkey mullein (<i>Eremocarpus setigerus</i>)	Rosamond eriastrum (<i>Eriastrum rosamondense</i>)
Alkali mariposa lily (<i>Calochortus striatus</i>)	Mojave spineflower (<i>Chorizanthe spinosa</i>)	Small flowered poppy (<i>Eschscholtzia minutiflora</i>)
Woody bottlewasher (<i>Camissonia boothii</i>)	Mojave stinkweed (<i>Cleomella obtusifolia</i>)	Common tarweed (<i>Hemizonia pungens</i>)
Saltgrass (<i>Distichlis spicata</i>)	Bud sage (<i>Artemisia spinescens</i>)	Russian thistle (<i>Salsola iberica</i>)
Fiddleneck (<i>Amsinckia tessellate</i>)	Pineapple weed (<i>Matricaria discoidea</i>)	Annual burweed (<i>Franseria acanthicarpa</i>)
Red stemmed filaree (<i>Erodium cicutarium</i>)	Barb-wire tumble weed (<i>Salsola paulensii</i>)	Tumble mustard (<i>Sisymbrium altisissimum</i>)
Schismus (<i>Schismus</i> sp.)	Red brome (<i>Bromus rubens</i>)	Cheatgrass (<i>Bromus tectorum</i>)
Mojave rabbit brush (<i>Chrysothamnus nauseosis mohavensis</i>)	Foxtail barley (<i>Hordeum leporinum</i>)	Mushroom spp. (Order: Fungi)

**Table 8
Observed Animal Species**

Rodents (Order: Rodentia)	Pocket gopher (<i>Thomomys bottae</i>)	Desert cottontail (<i>Sylvilagus auduboni</i>)
Black-tailed jackrabbit (<i>Lepus californicus</i>)	Coyote (<i>Canis lanrans</i>)	Desert kit fox (<i>Vulpes macrotis</i>)
Domestic cat (<i>Felis</i> sp.)	Owl sp. (Strigiformes)	Burrowing owl (<i>Athene cunicularia</i>)
Common raven (<i>Corvus corax</i>)	Sage sparrow (<i>Amphispiza belli</i>)	White crowned sparrow (<i>Zonotrichia leucophrys</i>)
Side-blotched lizard (<i>Uta stansburiana</i>)	Funnel spider (Order: Araneida)	Grasshopper (Order: Orthoptera)
Dragonfly (Order: Odonata)		

The project site is characteristic of a shadscale-alkali sacaton habitat with clay pans and dunes. Shadscale, Mojave spineflower, schismus, and cheat grass were the dominant species on the project site. No Joshua trees are present on the project site. Alkali mariposa lily skeletons were observed within the project site and multiple observations for this species are noted in the CNDDDB for the general area. Additionally, Rosamond eriastrum skeletons were also observed within the project site. These species are considered species of special concern by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Mitigation measures have been identified below requiring springtime surveys and payment of a fee for the acquisition of conservation property. No other special status plant species were identified on the project site during the survey.

No desert tortoise or Mohave ground squirrels were identified on the project site nor would they be expected to occur. No federally or state listed animal species are expected to occur on the project site.

Desert kit foxes are a fully protected species as a fur bearing mammal by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. No kit foxes or potential dens were observed on the project site during the survey; however, old kit fox scat was observed. Prior to the start of construction, a preconstruction survey shall be conducted to determine if there are any kit fox burrows on the project site. A mitigation measure has been identified for the preconstruction survey and the appropriate procedures to follow in the event that an occupied kit fox den is identified with implementation of this mitigation measure, any impacts to kit foxes would be less than significant.

The project site provides suitable habitat for nesting for smaller birds and may provide suitable foraging habitat for raptors. Nesting habitat for raptors is not present on the project site though suitable habitat is present at Apollo Park. A preconstruction nesting bird survey would be required and appropriate buffers would be required if any nesting birds are encountered. Additionally, a burrowing owl was observed within the study site along with one definitive cover site and two potential cover sites. The cover site being used had a sufficient amount of burrowing owl sign to indicate that the owl had been present on the site for a while. Burrowing owl is considered a species of special concern and mitigation measures for this species are listed below.

With implementation of the identified mitigation measures, impacts to biological resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

2. Prior to the issuance of any construction related permits, the applicant shall retain a biologist to conduct a springtime sensitive plant survey specifically focused on alkali mariposa lilies and Rosamond eriastrum. In the event that a springtime survey cannot be conducted, the biologist shall map all habitat suitable for these special status plant species. The biologist's report shall include the total acreage of each special status species present or the suitable habitat for these species and the applicant shall be required to pay \$2,405/acre for these areas. The funds shall be placed into a designated account and utilized for the acquisition of conservation habitat within the Antelope Valley.
3. The applicant shall retain a qualified biologist who shall conduct burrowing owl protocol surveys on the project site in accordance with the procedures established by the California

Department of Fish and Wildlife in the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation prior to the issuance of any construction related permits. If burrowing owls are identified during the surveys, the applicant shall contact the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to develop appropriate mitigation/management procedures. The applicant shall submit a final Burrowing Owl Mitigation Plan to the City prior to the City issuing construction permits. The applicant shall implement all measures identified in the Burrowing Owl Mitigation Plan.

At a minimum, the following shall occur:

- If burrowing owls are identified during the non-nesting season, a qualified biologist shall install one-way gates to relocate the owl to a suitable nearby property. Upon confirmation that the burrow is empty, the burrow shall be collapsed.
 - In the event that a breeding pair or female owl with offspring are present at the burrow, a buffer zone of at least 50 feet shall be established around the burrow until the offspring have fledged and left the burrow. No work shall occur within the buffer zone. The specific buffer zone shall be established in coordination with CDFW.
4. A nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 30 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities. If active bird nests are identified during the survey, the applicant shall contact the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to determine the appropriate mitigation/management requirements. Impacts to nesting birds will be avoided by delay of work or establishing a buffer of 500 feet around active raptor nests and 50 feet around other migratory bird species.
5. A preconstruction survey for desert kit fox shall be conducted no more than 30 days prior to the start of construction. In the event that potential dens are observed, the following buffer distances shall be established prior to construction activities:
- Desert kit fox potential den: 30 feet
 - Desert kit fox active den: 100 feet
 - Desert kit fox natal den: 500 feet

If avoidance of potential dens is not possible, the following measures shall be enacted:

- If the qualified biologist determines that potential dens are inactive, the biologist shall excavate these dens by hand with a shovel to prevent foxes from re-using them during construction.
- If the qualified biologist determines that potential dens may be active, an on-site passive relocation program shall be implemented. This program shall consist of excluding foxes from occupied burrows by installation of one way doors at burrow entrances, monitoring of the burrow for one week to confirm usage has been discontinued and excavation and collapse of the burrow to prevent reoccupation.

- After the qualified biologist determines that kit foxes have stopped using active dens within the project boundary, the dens shall be hand-excavated with a shovel to prevent re-use during construction.
- b. According to the biological resources report, the project site is located within the Amargosa Creek drainage (ephemeral wash system). Ephemeral drainages and connecting clay pans occur throughout the project site. These drainages and clay pans may be considered waters of the State by either or both the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. If these drainages are determined to be waters of the State, a Streambed Alteration Agreement and/or a Section 401 water quality permit would be required prior to any construction activities. Mitigation measures have been identified below to ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

6. The applicant shall consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to determine whether a Streambed Alteration Agreement is required for the washes on the project site. A copy of the agreement or documentation stating an agreement is unnecessary shall be submitted to the City of Lancaster prior to the issuance of any construction-related permits.
7. The applicant shall consult with the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to determine if the washes on the project site are subject to their jurisdiction. Any necessary permits from the RWQCB shall be obtained prior to the issuance of construction related permits (e.g., grading, building, etc.) by the City of Lancaster.
- 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 help offset the cumulative loss of biological resources in the Antelope Valley as a result of development. This fee is required of all projects occurring on previously undeveloped land regardless of the biological resources present and is utilized to enhance biological resources through education programs and the acquisition of property for conservation. 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 federal land, specifically land owned by the Bureau of Land Management. In conjunction with the Coordinated Management Plan, a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) was proposed which would have applied to all private properties within the Plan Area. However, this HCP was never approved by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife nor was it adopted by the local

agencies (counties and cities) within the Plan Area. As such, there is no HCP that is applicable to the project site and 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 for 30th Street West and Avenue G, City of Lancaster, California” and dated October 2021. The cultural report included both a records search and a survey of the project site.

A records search for the project site and vicinity was conducted at the South Central Coast Information Center on August 27, 2021. A total of seven cultural resource surveys have been conducted with a half mile of the project site; one of which included the project site but did not include surveys. One cultural resource was identified during these previous surveys. This resource is an historic road located on the south side of Avenue G.

On October 26, 2021 a survey of the project site was conducted by walking pedestrian transects. These transects were spaced approximately 15 meters apart and were walked in an east-west direction. During the course of the survey, three historic trash scatters were identified and are described below. No architectural remains, landscaping or roads are present at any of these sites.

- Site 1: This site is a tight, dense concentration of primarily clear and green domestic glass which dates to the 1930s. Kitchen and cleaning bottles, condiment bottles, ceramics and some deteriorated metal artifacts are also present.
- Site 2: This site is a dense historic trash scatter located along the northern property. This site consists primarily of clear and green domestic glass with some lumber and automotive artifacts. The site contains kitchen and cleaning bottles, condiment bottles, ceramics and some deteriorated metal artifacts and dates to the 1930s.
- Site 3: This site is a more diffuse site with modern trash overlaying it. The site dates to the mid-twentieth century and are scattered in a linear fashion. The site contains domestic artifacts including paint and food cans.

These sites are common across the Antelope Valley and are not eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources under any of the four criteria. Specifically, the sites are not associated with events that have made a significant contribution; not associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history; do not embody distinctive characteristics; or yield or have the potential to yield information important to the prehistory or prehistory of the local area, California or the nation. As such, impacts to historic resources would be less than significant.

No other cultural resources were identified during the field survey. No human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, were identified on the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

While no specific tribal or cultural resources were identified during the AB 52 process, the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians has identified the area as culturally sensitive and has requested mitigation measures to be included in the event that previously unknown resources are discovered during construction activities. These mitigation measures have been included. With incorporation of the mitigation measures, impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

8. 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 project outside of the buffered area may continue during this assessment period. Additionally, the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians and the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians shall be contacted regarding any pre-contact and/or post-contact historic era 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.
9. In the event that cultural resources are discovered during project activities, and the find deemed to be significant as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), the applicant shall retain a professional Native American monitored procured by the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians 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.
10. The applicant shall, in good faith, consult with the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians and the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians on the disposition and treatment of any Tribal Cultural Resource encountered during all ground disturbing activities.
11. If humans or funerary objects are encountered during any construction activities associated with the proposed project, work within 100-foot buffer shall cease and the County Coroner shall be contacted pursuant to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5.

12. If significant Native American resources are discovered and avoidance cannot be ensured a Secretary of Interior qualified archaeologist shall be retained to develop a cultural resource Treatment Plan, as well as a Discovery and Monitoring Plan. A copy of the draft document shall be provided to the appropriate tribe(s) for review and comment. All in field investigation, assessment and/or data recovery pursuant to the Treatment Plan shall be monitored by a Tribal Monitor. Additionally, the applicant and the City of Lancaster shall consult with the appropriate tribe(s) on the discussion and treatment of any artifacts or other cultural materials encountered during the project.

	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, 2020.

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.

	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 a soil is reduced by earthquake shaking or other events. This phenomenon occurs in saturated soils that undergo intense seismic shaking typically associated with an earthquake. There are three specific conditions that need to be in place for liquefaction to occur: loose granular soils, shallow groundwater (usually less than 50 feet below ground surface) and intense seismic shaking. In 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 measures listed below is required to control dust/wind erosion. With implementation of the mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

- 13. The applicant shall submit a Dust Control Plan to the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) for review and approval in accordance with Rule 403, Fugitive Dust, prior to the issuance of any grading and/or construction permits. This plan shall demonstrate adequate water or dust suppressant application equipment to mitigate all disturbed areas.
 - 14. Signage shall be displayed on the project site in accordance with Antelope Valley Air Quality Management Rule 403 (Appendix A).
- 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 closest sinkholes and fissures to the project site are located in the vicinity of 30th Street West and Avenue G. However, 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 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 VI.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 of 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 waste water 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 AVAQMD has established thresholds for GHG emissions which, if exceeded, would render a project as having a significant adverse impact (Table 3). The proposed project is for a distribution facility for FedEx Ground and would generate GHGs during construction and operation but not in significant quantities. As discussed in Item III.b, GHG emissions were calculated for the proposed project and the results are summarized in Table 9 (Construction) and Table 10 “(Operation).

**Table 9
Project Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Activity	Daily GHG Emissions (lbs/day of CO ₂ e)
Construction Emissions (2022)	14,076
Construction Emissions (2023)	13,662
Activity	Annual GHG Emissions (MTCO ₂ e)
Construction Emissions (2022)	803
Construction Emissions (2023)	447

Since the GHG emissions associated with construction and operation would be significantly lower than the established thresholds, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact.

**Table 10
 Project Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Activity	Daily GHG Emissions (lbs/day of CO ₂ e)
Area Sources	<1
Energy	70
Mobile	17,974
Offroad (Electric Forklifts)	0
Waste	N/A
Water	N/A
Total Operational Emissions	18,045
Activity	Annual GHG Emissions (MTCO ₂ e)
Area Sources	<1
Energy	192
Mobile	2,894
Offroad (Electric Forklifts)	0
Waste	119
Water	257
Total Operational Emissions	3,463

- b. The City of Lancaster Final Climate Action Plan was adopted in March 2017. As part of the climate action plan (CAP), a greenhouse gas emissions inventory for the City was developed which consisted of both community-wide emission and emissions from government operations for future years based on demographic growth. The CAP also identified projects that would enhance the City’s ability to further reduce GHG emissions. A total of 61 projects/measures across eight sectors were identified, which include: 1) traffic; 2) energy; 3) municipal operations; 4) water; 5) waste; 6) built environment; 7) community; and 8) land use. The forecasts do not account for any new federal, State, regional, or local policies that may be implemented after 2015, nor does it assume that any policies in place in 2015 will become more stringent. Forecasts for both community and government operations were prepared for 2020, 2030, 2040, and 2050. Under all scenarios assessed, the City meets the 2020 target and makes substantial progress towards achieving post-2020 reductions.

The proposed project would also be in compliance with the greenhouse gas emission goals and policies identified in the City of Lancaster’s General Plan (pgs. 2-19 to 2-24) and with the City’s Climate Action Plan. Specifically, the proposed project would be consistent with the following measures identified in the climate action plan.

Transportation

- Measure 4.1.2c: Pedestrian Amenities – The proposed project would install pedestrian facilities along Avenue G and 30th Street West. These facilities would tie into the other existing facilities in the general area.

Energy

- Measure 4.2.1a: Renewable Energy Purchase Plan – All development receives its power from Lancaster Choice Energy unless the entity chooses to opt out.

Water

- Measure 4.4.2a: Sensor Technology – Water saving irrigation will be installed with landscaping on the project site. Different types of technology are available for the irrigation systems and it is possible that the developer will utilize sensor technology if it is the most effective for the type of landscaping being installed.

Waste

- Measure 4.5.1b: Recycling Incentives – Trash enclosures will be provided on the project site. All trash enclosures would be a minimum of 165 square feet and provide bins for trash, recycling, and organics.

Community

- Measure 4.7.2a: Sustainability Incubator/Local Job Creation – The proposed project would generate new jobs that do not currently exist within the local economy.
- Measure 4.7.3a: Xeriscaping – All landscaping within the development would be native and/or drought tolerant in accordance with the City's Municipal Code.
- Measure 4.7.4c: Conservation Habitat Acquisition – All development projects are required to pay a Biological Impact Fee (\$770/acre) to offset the overall loss of biological resources within the Antelope Valley. This fee is utilized to fund the acquisition of habitat which is placed under a conservation easement. The proposed development would be required to pay approximately \$30,800.

Therefore, impacts with respect to conflicts with an agency's plan, policies, or 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 the construction and operation a FedEx Ground Distribution facility and associated vehicle maintenance building. The site would be improved with drainage basins, parking areas, and landscaping. Typical construction materials would be utilized during development of the proposed project. The Antelope Valley Freeway is designated as a hazardous materials transportation corridor (LMEA p. 9.1-14 and Figure 9.1-4). However, the project site is approximately 0.50 miles west of the freeway and 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 not located within a quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The closest school to the project site is Desert View Elementary School located at 1555 West Avenue H-10. This is approximately two miles southeast of the project site. Additionally, the proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous/acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- d. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for the project site by Partner Engineering and Science, Inc. The results of the study are documented in a report entitled "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, Vacant Land, NEC 30th Street West and West Avenue G, Lancaster, California 93536" and dated July 14, 2021.

A survey of the project site was conducted on July 8, 2021 to determine the presence of any recognized environmental concerns. Some evidence of illegal dumping of solid waste was observed on the site; however, no evidence of hazardous materials/waste disposal was identified. No spills, stains, or other indications of a release was identified on the project site. One pad-mounted transformer was observed on the project site; however, it was not labeled indicating PCB content and no staining or leakage was observed in the vicinity of the transformer. Therefore, it is not anticipated to be an environmental concern. No impacts would occur.

There are no structures on the project site and as such lead-based paint and asbestos containing materials would not be a concern.

In addition to the survey of the project site, a regulatory database search was conducted for the project site and immediately surrounding properties within the specified search distances by EDR. The subject site and surrounding properties were not identified on any regulatory database and no impacts would occur.

- e. The project site is located within the boundaries of the General William J Fox Airfield Land Compatibility Plan. Within the plan, the project site is located predominantly in Zone D with a small portion (southeast corner of the site) located in Zone E.

Zone D is designated a "Primary Traffic Patterns" and prohibits hazards to flight (e.g., tall objects, visual/electronic forms of interference, increase in birds, etc.) and requires a deed notice. However, industrial uses are not prohibited and the project would not require an airspace review as the building is not over 100 feet. The project would also not exceed the maximum number of people per acre (300 people per single acre; 150 people average) as it is a distribution facility.

While employees and visitors to the site may notice an increase in noise when aircraft are taking off or landing, it is not likely to disrupt any project related operations as all operations would occur inside the building. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- f. Access to the project site would be taken from 30th Street West. 30th Street West and Avenue G are already improved roadways and the proposed project would add any improvements necessary to meet current standards. Neither 30th Street West nor Avenue G are identified as evacuation

routes. However, the Antelope Valley Freeway (State Route 14) is designated as an evacuation route. Based on the traffic study prepared for the proposed project, the development is expected to generate approximately 1,532 daily trips. This amount of traffic is not anticipated to cause any operational or safety issues at any of the area intersections and the freeway can handle the increase in the traffic volumes. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact or physically block any identified evacuation routes and would not interfere with any adopted emergency response plan.

- g. The property surrounding the project site is undeveloped and could be subject to vegetation fires. However, the project site is located within the boundaries of Fire Station No. 130, located at 44558 40th Street West. This fire station would serve the project site in the event of a fire with additional support available from other fire stations. Therefore, 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 small lake at Apollo Park is located approximately 0.75 miles to the northwest and the Amargosa Creek (desert wash) is located approximately one mile to the east on the eastern side of the Antelope Valley Freeway. The proposed project would be required to comply

with all applicable provisions of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. The NPDES program establishes a comprehensive storm water quality program to manage urban storm water and minimize pollution of the environment to the maximum extent practicable. The reduction of pollutants in urban storm water discharge through the use of structural and nonstructural Best Management Practices (BMPs) is one of the primary objectives of the water quality regulations. BMPs that are typically used to management runoff water quality include controlling roadway and parking lot contaminants by installing oil and grease separators at storm drain inlets, cleaning parking lots on a regular basis, incorporating peak-flow reduction and infiltration features (grass swales, infiltration trenches and grass filter strips) into landscaping and implementing educational programs. The proposed project would incorporate appropriate BMPs during construction, as determined by the City of Lancaster Development Services Department. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed project consists of the construction of a FedEx Ground Distribution facility and small associated vehicle maintenance building. The proposed project would contain a couple of drainage basins with perimeter landscaping. Additionally, the proposed project would comply all applicable rules and regulations regarding wastewater and would be registered with the Sanitation District as an industrial wastewater generator. As such the proposed project would not violate water quality standards and 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 the paving of the parking areas and the construction of the buildings. 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 Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) (06037C0410F). Flood Zone X is located outside of both the 100-year flood zone and the 500-year flood zone. 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. Apollo Park contains a small lake which is located approximately 0.75 miles to the northwest. In the event of an earthquake, it is not anticipated that the lake would create a seiche that would impact the project site. 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 is a for the construction and operation of a 250,000 square foot FedEx ground distribution facility on approximately 40 acres. The project site is located within the Fox Field Specific Plan area which is designated for a mix of industrial type uses. Additionally, the western and southern property boundaries are formed by 30th Street West and Avenue G, respectively, and all the surrounding properties are vacant. The proposed project would not block a public street, trail or other access route or result in a physical barrier that would divide the community. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- b. The proposed project is consistent with the City’s General Plan, and the Fox Field Specific Plan (SP 95-02) and must be in conformance with the Lancaster Municipal Code. Table 11 provides a consistency analysis of the proposed project with respect to the relevant goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan. 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. As the proposed project does not involve the provision of housing nor is housing permitted under the specific plan, a consistency analysis with the Housing Element was not conducted.

**Table 11
General Plan Consistency Analysis**

Goals, Objectives and Policies	Consistency Analysis
Policy 3.1.1: Ensure that development does not adversely affect the groundwater supply.	No ground water pumping will occur as part of the proposed project. All water supplied to the development will be provided by Los Angeles County Waterworks District #40 in accordance with existing regulations and agreements.
Policy 3.2.1: Promote the use of water conservation measures in the landscape plans of new developments.	The landscaping proposed as part of the proposed project would be aesthetically pleasing and native/drought tolerant in

	accordance with the City of Lancaster’s Municipal Code, Section 8.50, and the requirements of the Fox Field Specific Plan.
Policy 3.2.5: Promote the use of water conservation measures in the design of new developments.	The landscaping associated with the proposed development will utilize drought tolerant plants and irrigation systems that are appropriate to the specific plants.
Policy 3.3.1: Minimize the amount of vehicular miles traveled.	The proposed development will provide another source of jobs for the local economy. This will allow residents to work in the Antelope Valley instead of commuting to the Los Angeles basin for work. This would reduce the amount of VMT generated for work-based trips. Additionally, the proposed distribution facility would replace another distribution facility, placing the distribution facility closer to the end users.
Policy 3.3.3: Minimize air pollutant emissions by new and existing development.	The proposed project could comply with all air district regulations regarding air emissions and dust control.
Policy 3.4.2: Preserve significant desert wash areas to protect sensitive species that utilize these habitat areas.	As discussed in the biological resources section, the project site contains some areas which may be considered as waters of the state and sensitive plant species (e.g., alkali mariposa lilies) were present on the project site. Mitigation measures have been identified which would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.
Policy 3.4.4: Ensure that development proposals, including City sponsored projects, are analyzed for short- and long-term impacts to biological resources and that appropriate mitigation measures are implemented.	Section IV of this initial study discusses the biological resources on the project site and identifies mitigation measures to ensure impacts to these resources are less than significant.
Policy 3.5.1: Minimize erosion problems resulting from development activities.	The proposed project will comply with all dust control and erosion measures. These include best management practices as identified in NPDES and the air quality regulations pertaining to dust control.
Policy 3.5.2: Since certain soils in the Lancaster study area have exhibited shrink-swell behavior and a potential for fissuring, and subsidence may exist in other areas, minimize the potential for damage resulting from the occurrence of soils movements.	A geotechnical study is required to be prepared by a registered professional engineer and submitted to the City as part of the grading and building plans. All recommendations within the study are required to be followed.
Policy 3.6.1: Reduce energy consumption by establishing land use patterns which would	The proposed project would be built in an area that has been designated for industrial type

decrease automobile travel and increase the use of energy efficient modes of transportation.	uses. It would provide additional job opportunities for local residents which would reduce the amount of energy consumed on transportation.
Policy 3.6.2: Encourage innovate building, site design, and orientation techniques which minimize energy use.	The proposed project would be constructed in accordance with the Uniform Building Code and the California Green Building Code.
Policy 3.6.3: Encourage the incorporation of energy conservation measures in existing and new structures.	The proposed project would be constructed in accordance with the Uniform Building Code and the California Green Building Code.
Policy 3.6.6: Consider and promote the use of alternative energy such as wind energy and solar energy.	The proposed project would obtain its energy from Lancaster Choice Energy which provides energy from a variety of sources including wind and solar. Additionally, the proposed project would be able to install solar panels to provide behind the meter solar energy for the power.
Policy 4.3.1: Ensure that noise-sensitive land uses and noise generators are located and designed in such a manner that City noise objectives will be achieved.	The proposed development meets the noise standards of the City's General Plan. Additionally, the closest sensitive noise receptors are located approximately 0.75 miles north of the project site and 0.75 miles northwest of the project site
Policy 4.4.2: Limit the uses surrounding airport facilities at Fox Field, Edwards Air Force Base, and Plant 42 to ensure their continued safe operation.	The proposed project is located within the boundaries of the Fox Field Airport Land Use Plan. The project complies requirements of the Land Use Plan and would not impact the operation of the Fox Field airfield.
Policy 4.5.1: Ensure that activities within the City of Lancaster transport, use, store, and dispose of hazardous materials in a responsible manner which protects the public health and safety.	The proposed project may utilize some common hazardous materials during its operations including oils/lubricants, pesticides, cleaning agents, etc. All use would be in accordance with applicable rules and regulations. Additionally, no fueling operations would take place on the project site.
Policy 4.7.2: Ensure that the design of new development minimizes the potential for fire.	The proposed project would be developed in accordance with all applicable fire code regulations. Additionally, fire hydrants would be installed both on/off site and the site is within the service boundaries of several fire stations.
Policy 9.1.2: Maintain ongoing, open communication with area school districts, and take a proactive role to ensure that communication is maintained.	All projects are routed to the appropriate school districts for review to ensure that they can adequately provide for any new students as a result of development projects.
Policy 14.1.1: Design the City's street system	The proposed project would improve both 30 th

<p>to serve both the existing population and future residents.</p>	<p>Street West and Avenue G to meet the requirements established by the City of Lancaster and the Fox Field Specific Plan.</p>
<p>Policy 14.1.4: Encourage the design of roads and traffic controls to optimize the safe traffic flow by minimizing turning movements, curb parking, uncontrolled access, and frequent stops.</p>	<p>Both 30th Street West and Avenue G would be fully improved to meet the amount of traffic utilizing these roadways. Additionally, the project would provide adequate parking on the project site.</p>
<p>Policy 14.2.2: Manage the City’s roadway network so that it is aesthetically pleasing through the development and maintenance of streetscapes.</p>	<p>The proposed project would install enhanced landscaping in a 20-foot wide area between Avenue G and the drainage basin on the project site. Additionally, Avenue G would be improved to have a meandering sidewalk along the project frontage.</p>
<p>Policy 14.5.1: Provide adequate roadways and a support system to accommodate both automobile and truck traffic.</p>	<p>The project site is located along Avenue G near the Antelope Valley Freeway. These roadways would be able to handle the traffic generated by the proposed project.</p>
<p>Policy 15.1.2: Cooperate with local water agencies to provide an adequate water supply system to meet the standards for domestic and emergency needs.</p>	<p>The proposed project would obtain its water from Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40 in accordance with existing regulations and requirements.</p>
<p>Policy 15.3.1: Direct growth to areas with adequate existing facilities and services, areas which have adequate facilities and services committed, or areas where public services and facilities can be economically extended.</p>	<p>The necessary utilities and services to support the proposed project are located within vicinity of the site or can be easily extended to serve the project site.</p>
<p>Goal 16: To promote economic self-sufficiency and a fiscally solvent and financially stable community.</p>	<p>The proposed project would provide additional jobs and revenues associated with the construction and operation of the facility.</p>
<p>Policy 16.3.1: Promote development patterns which will minimize the costs of infrastructure development, public facilities development and municipal service cost delivery.</p>	<p>The project site is located within an area that is designated for industrial uses and has the appropriate infrastructure to support those uses.</p>
<p>Policy 17.1.4: Provide for office and industrial based employment-generating lands which are highly accessible and compatible with other uses in the community.</p>	<p>The project site is located within an area that is designated for industrial uses and has the appropriate infrastructure to support those uses. Additionally, the Antelope Valley Freeway makes the project site easily accessible.</p>
<p>Policy 18.2.2: Encourage appropriate development to locate so that municipal services can be efficiently provided.</p>	<p>The project site is located within an area that is designated for industrial uses and has the appropriate infrastructure to support those uses.</p>

In addition to the City’s General Plan, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) adopts a Regional Transportation/Sustainable Conservation Strategy (RTP/SCS) every five years. On May 7, 2020 SCAG adopted by the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, known as Connect SoCal, for federal transportation conformity purposes only. On September 3, 2020 SCAG adopted Connect SoCal for all other purposes. The RTP/SCS identifies ten regional goals; these goals are identified in Table 12 along with the project’s consistency with these goals.

Table 12
Connect SoCal Consistency Analysis

Goals	Consistency
Goal 1: Encourage regional economic prosperity and global competitiveness.	The proposed project would help support regional economic prosperity by providing more local jobs
Goal 2: Improve mobility, accessibility, reliability and travel safety for people and goods.	The project site is located in close proximity to the Antelope Valley Freeway which will facilitate the movement of goods.
Goal 3: Enhance the preservation, security, and resilience of the regional transportation system.	This goal is not applicable to the proposed project.
Goal 4: Increase person and goods movement and travel choices within the transportation system.	This goal is not applicable to the proposed project.
Goal 5: Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality.	The proposed project would provide a distribution facility in close proximity to the end users of the service. This would be the amount of GHG and air quality emissions generated.
Goal 6: Support health and equitable communities.	This goal is not applicable to the proposed project.
Goal 7: Adapt to a changing climate and support an integrated regional development pattern and transportation network.	This goal is not applicable to the proposed project.
Goal 8: Leverage new transportation technologies and data-driven solutions that result in more efficient travel.	This goal is not applicable to the proposed project.
Goal 9: Encourage development of diverse housing types in areas that are supported by multiple transportation options.	There is no housing associated with the proposed project. This goal is not applicable to the proposed project.
Goal 10: Promote conservation of natural and agricultural lands and restoration of habitats.	This goal is not applicable to the proposed project.

	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 3 (contains potential but presently unproven resources.) However, it is considered unlikely that the Lancaster area has large valuable mineral and aggregate deposits. Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. <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 70 dBA for commercial and industrial uses. The current noise levels on the roadways immediately adjacent to the project site are as follows: 1) 30th Street West from Avenue F to Avenue H ranges from 49.9 dBA to 52.1 dBA and 2) Avenue G from 30th Street West to the Freeway is 59.5 dBA. The proposed project is anticipated to generate approximately 1,532 daily trips between delivery and employee vehicles. As such the noise levels in the vicinity of the project such are consistent with the standards of the General Plan. While the noise levels are consistent with the standards of the General Plan, additional features of the proposed project (e.g., landscaping, fencing, setbacks, etc.) would ensure that the project remains in compliance with the General Plan standards.

Construction activities associated with earth moving equipment and other construction machinery would temporarily increase noise levels in the vicinity of the project site. The closest noise sensitive receptors to the project site are the two single family residences and small church located along Avenue F and Apollo Park. These uses are located approximately .75 miles to the north and northwest, respectively. Some construction activities may be audible at these locations, but due to the distance it is unlikely that the construction noise would be bothersome and would not exceed the established noise thresholds. However, all construction activities would be in accordance with the City’s noise ordinance with respect to days of the week and time of day. Additionally, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce the noise generated by construction activities to the extent feasible. These measures are construction best management practices. Incorporation of these measures would ensure that all construction noise impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

15. 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.
 16. 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.
 17. Electrically powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, where feasible.
 18. Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking and maintenance areas shall be located as far away as practicable from noise-sensitive receptors.
 19. The use of noise producing signal, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells shall be for safety warning purposes only.
 20. No project-related public address or music system shall be audible at any adjacent receptor.
 21. All noise producing construction equipment and vehicles using internal combustion engines shall be equipped with mufflers
- b. The proposed project is not anticipated to generate any groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels during construction as no subterranean structures (e.g., underground parking, etc.) are part of the project. Some construction activities may generate rumbling type noise; however, these activities are not anticipated to be noticeable by noise sensitive receptors as the nearest ones are located approximately 0.75 miles to the north and northwest. During operational activities, some vibration noise may be generated due to the varying sizes of trucks accessing the facility. However, this noise would be similar to the noise generated by other distribution facilities in the area (e.g., Sygma, Rite, and Michaels) and would be considered less than significant.
- c. As discussed in Section IX.e, the project site is located within Zones D and E of the General William J Fox Airfield Land Use Compatibility Plan. As such, workers and visitors to the site may be exposed to aircraft noise during take off and landing. However, this noise is sporadic and all project related operational activities would occur indoors. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

	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 not generate substantial population growth as the project is an industrial development and does not include residential uses. It is possible that individuals could relocate to the Antelope Valley to work at the proposed distribution facility. However, it is much more likely that individuals currently living in the Antelope Valley would be hired to work at the distribution facility. Additionally, the project site is located an area that was planned for industrial development and the jobs, and by extension the population, created by the proposed project is already accounted for in the City’s General Plan and regional planning documents.

The proposed development would be accessed from 30th Street West and the roadways in the general vicinity are already improved and no new roadways would be constructed. Therefore, 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 Lancaster School District and 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 may generate additional population growth through the creation of new jobs and would contribute on an incremental basis to the use of the existing park and recreational facilities. The proposed project does not involve the construction of any parks or recreational amenities. However, the applicant would be required to pay to applicable park fees which would offset the impacts to the existing parks. 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 any programs, plans, ordinances and policies with respect to transportation systems including, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The project site is located at the northeast corner of two major roadways, Avenue G and 30th Street West, and in close proximity to the Antelope Valley Freeway. Additionally, the proposed project would be installing sidewalks along Avenue G and 30th Street West and the proposed development would be required to provide bicycle facilities in accordance with the California Green Building Code. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- 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 screen 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 meet any of these thresholds.

As a result, a study was prepared to analyze the proposed project’s VMT impact. The results of the study are documented in a report prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers (LLG) entitled “Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis, FedEx Lancaster, City of Lancaster, California” and dated October 26, 2021.

In coordination with the City, it was determined that the most appropriate metric for determining VMT impacts for the proposed project would be based on service population. This is based on the total VMT for the entire area divided by the total service population (employees and residents). Based on the analysis prepared for both the Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) the project

site is located in and the service area as a whole (Antelope Valley Planning Area), the proposed project would reduce the amount of VMT per service population in both the 2012 baseline year and in 2040. A summary of the results are provided in Table 13. As such, VMT impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

**Table 13
 Vehicle Miles Traveled Summary**

Metric	2012 Baseline		2040 Future	
	Without Project	With Project	Without Project	With Project
TAZ VMT	12,758.39	50,162.52	114,154.22	156,667.96
TAZ SP	65	551	377	863
TAZ VMT/SP	196.28	91.04	302.80	181.54
AVPA OD VMT	76,424,877.60	76,489,595.38	91,775,326.98	88,672,566.49
AVPA SP	1,889,610	1,893,010	2,458,716	2,462,118
AVPA VMT/SP	40.44	40.41	37.33	36.01

TAZ – Traffic Analysis Zone
 VMT – vehicle miles traveled
 SP – service population
 AVPA – Antelope Valley Planning Area
 OD – origin/destination

In addition to the VMT study, a local transportation assessment was also prepared to ensure that the roadways in the vicinity of the project site would continue to operation efficiently with implementation of the proposed project. The results of this study prepared by LLG are documented in a report entitled “Local Transportation Assessment, FedEx Lancaster, City of Lancaster, California” and dated October 25, 2021. The study concluded that the roadways would continue to operate in an efficiency manner.

- c. The proposed project would be accessed by both 30th Street West and Avenue G. Both of these roadways are improved in the vicinity of the project. The proposed project would include additional improvements to these roadways to meet the ultimate design of the roadways. These improvements would not increase hazardous in the vicinity of the project nor create dangerous design situations. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- d. The project site would be access from both 30th Street West and Avenue G which would provide adequate emergency access to the project site. Drive aisles within the project site would be design to the standards required by the Los Angeles County Fire Department, ensuring adequate emergency access. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

- a. Three historic trash scatters were identified during the survey of the project site. No archaeological resources were identified. No specific tribal cultural resources were identified during the AB 52 process; however, the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians identified the area as culturally sensitive and requested mitigation measures be included to address any discovery of previously unknown cultural resources. These mitigation measures have been included in the cultural resources section. As such, no impacts would occur.

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

- a. The proposed project would be required to connect 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 right-of-ways. Connections to these utilities are assumed as part of the proposed project and impacts to environmental resources have been discussed throughout the document. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 has not indicated any problems in supplying water to the proposed project from existing facilities. No new construction of water treatment or new or expanded entitlements would be required. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c. The project site is located within the jurisdictional boundaries of District No. 14. All wastewater 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 14.3 mgd. The proposed project would discharge to a local sewer line for conveyance to the Districts' Rosamond Outfall Replacement Trunk Sewer, located in 20th Street West at Avenue F-8. This trunk sewer has a capacity of 67.7 mgd and conveyed a peak flow of 22.6 mgd when last measured in 2018. The proposed project would generate 10,665 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. 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 be in compliance with applicable regulations on solid waste transport and disposal, including waste stream reduction mandated under AB 341.
- The proposed project would generate solid waste during construction and operation which would contribute to an overall impact on landfill services (GPEIR pgs. 5.13-25 to 5.13-28 and 5.13-31); although the 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 be in compliance with all State and local regulations regarding solid waste disposal. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- e. See Item XIX.d.

	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. 130 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
<u>XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</u>				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X		
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulative considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?		X		
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X		

a-c. The proposed project consists of the construction and operation of a 250,000 square FedEx Ground Distribution facility and associated vehicle maintenance building in the SP 95-02 zone. Other projects have been approved and/or submitted within approximately one mile of the project site (Table 14). 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 and Forest Resources, Energy Resources, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, and Wildfire. The project would create impacts to other resource areas and mitigation measures have identified for Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, and Noise. 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 14
 Related Projects List**

Case No.	Location	APNs	Acres	Description	Status
SPR 21-15	SWC Avenue G and 14 Freeway	3114-011-031	68.4	1.26 million square foot distribution facility	Under review
CUP 17-16 / TPM 82626	SEC 47 th Street West and William J Barnes Avenue	3105-001-042	32.75	563,000 sf cannabis cultivation and manufacturing facility	Approved

List of Referenced Documents and Available Locations*:

AIR:	Air Quality Study – Fedex Ground Distribution Facility, Lancaster, CA, M.S. Hatch Consulting, LLC, November 10, 2021	DSD
BRR:	Biological Resource Assessment of APN 3114-010-011, Lancaster, California, Mark Hagan, October 25, 2021	DSD
CRS:	A Phase I Cultural Resource Survey for 30 th Street West and Avenue G, City of Lancaster, California, Hudlow Cultural Resource Associates, October 2021	DSD
ESA:	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, Vacant Land NEC 30 th Street West and West Avenue G, Lancaster, California, 93536, Partner Engineering and Science, Inc. July 14, 2021	DSD
FIRM:	Flood Insurance Rate Map	DSD
GPEIR:	Lancaster General Plan Environmental Impact Report	DSD
LACSD:	Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts letter, August 31, 2021	DSD
LGP:	Lancaster General Plan	DSD
LMC:	Lancaster Municipal Code	DSD
LMEA:	Lancaster Master Environmental Assessment	DSD
LTA	Local Transportation Assessment, FedEx Lancaster, City of Lancaster, California, Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers, October 25, 2021	
SSHZ:	State Seismic Hazard Zone Maps	DSD
USGS:	United States Geological Survey Maps	DSD
USDA SCS:	United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Maps	DSD
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis, FedEx Lancaster, City of Lancaster, California, Linscott, Law & Greenspan Engineers, October 26, 2021	DSD

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