



COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT

City of Lancaster Initial Study

1. **Project title and File Number:** Tentative Tract Map No. 82777
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:** 10± gross acres on the west side of 65th
Street West between Avenue J-8 and
Avenue J-12 (APN: 3203-018-114)
(see Figure 1)
5. **Applicant name and address:** Henghou Group/Shizao Zheng
1378 West Zhongshan Road, Haishu District
Ningbo, China 315092
6. **General Plan designation:** Urban Residential (UR)
7. **Zoning:** R-7,000 (single family residential, minimum
lot size 7,000 square feet)

8. **Description of project:**

The proposed project consists of the subdivision of approximately 10 acres into 36 single family residential lots. The lots would range in size from 7,000 square feet to 16,844 square feet. Access to the subdivision would be provided from 65th Street West. The streets within the subdivision would be private while Avenue J-12, Avenue J-8, and 65th Street West would be public. A meandering sidewalk with landscaping would be provided on both 65th Street West and Avenue J-8.



Figure 1, Project Location Map




Figure 2, Conceptual Site Plan

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The project site is located in the western portion of the City of Lancaster which is rapidly developing. The project site is currently undeveloped and vacant. The property to the north, west, and south is undeveloped while the property to the east is developed with single family residential subdivisions. The State Prison is located a half mile to the northeast and Quartz Hill High School is located 1.5 miles south. Sundown Elementary School is located approximately 0.2 miles northeast of the project site. Table 1 provides a summary of the zoning and land uses of the immediately surrounding property.

**Table 1
Zoning/Land Use Information**

Direction	Zoning		Land Use
	City	County	
North	R-7,000	N/A	Vacant
East	R-7,000	N/A	Single family residences
South	R-7,000	N/A	Vacant
West	R-7,000	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 (CDFW)
- Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD)
- Los Angeles County Sanitation District #14
- Los Angeles County Waterworks District #40
- Los Angeles County Fire Department
- Southern California Edison

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 eight individuals associated with six tribes identified in the cultural resource report and/or who had requested to be included in the process. These letters were mailed on October 14, 2020 via certified return receipt mail. Table 2 identifies the tribes, the person to whom the letter was directed, and the date the letter was received.

Table 2
Tribal Notification

Tribe	Person/Title	Date Received
Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians	Rudy Ortega, Tribal President	October 19, 2020
Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians	Jairo Avila, Tribal Historic and Cultural Preservation Officer	October 19, 2020
Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation	Andrew Salas, Chairman	October 17, 2020
Serrano Nation of Mission Indians	Wayne Walker, Co-Chairperson	October 17, 2020
Serrano Nation of Mission Indians	Mark Cochrane, Co-Chairperson	October 17, 2020
San Fernando Band of Mission Indians	Donna Yocum, Chairperson	October 17, 2020
Morongo Band of Mission Indians	Robert Martin, Chairperson	October 19, 2020
Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation (formerly San Manuel Band of Mission Indians)	Ryan Nordness, Cultural Resource Analyst	October 17, 2020

Responses were received from two tribes: Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians and Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation (YSMN). The project site was identified as being located within ancestral territory; no specific tribal cultural resources were identified. However, the tribes requested specific mitigation measures to be included as part of the project to ensure proper handling and notification in the event of accidental discovery and monitoring of ground disturbing activities. These mitigation measures have been included in the cultural resources section.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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


 Jocelyn Swain, Senior Planner

2/17/23
 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 (65th Street West). The proposed project consists of the subdivision of the subject property into 36 single family residential lots. This subdivision would be similar to the subdivision immediately to the east and other subdivisions in the general vicinity. 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 impacts 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. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- c. The proposed project is consistent with the zoning code and general plan designation for the project site. The proposed project would also be in conformance with the City's Design Guidelines which were adopted on December 8, 2009 (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 moderate due to street lights, vehicle headlights, security lighting, and residential lighting from the residences immediately east of the project site. Operational lighting from the prison can be seen in the distance. Light and glare would be generated from the proposed project in the form of additional street lighting, parking area/community building lighting, residential lighting and motor vehicles. All lighting within 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. <u>AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.</u> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</p>				X
<p>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>				X
<p>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?</p>				X
<p>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>				X
<p>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>				X

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

The maps for each county are updated every two years. The Los Angeles County Farmland Map was last updated in 2018. Based on these maps, the project site is designated as Grazing Land. Grazing land is land on which the existing vegetation is suited to the grazing of livestock. 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 as R-7,000 (single family residential, minimum lot size 7,000 square feet) which does not allow for agricultural uses. Additionally, the project site is located in the central-western portion of the City which is developed with many residential subdivisions and vacant land. The surrounding property is zoned R-7,000 which does not allow for agricultural uses. The project site is not under agricultural production and none of the surrounding properties are under agricultural production. Additionally, the project site and surrounding area are not subject to a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- c-d. According to the City of Lancaster's General Plan, there are no forests or timberlands located within the City of Lancaster. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the rezoning of forest or timberland and would not cause the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest land. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- e. See responses to Items IIa-d.

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

- a. Development proposed under the City’s General Plan would not create air emissions that exceed the Air Quality Management Plan (GPEIR pgs. 5.5-21 to 5.5-22). The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan and no impacts would occur.
- b. The project site is located within the boundary of the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) and therefore, are subject to compliance with the thresholds established by the AVAQMD. These thresholds were provided in the AVAQMD's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Federal Conformity Guidelines document, dated August 2016. These thresholds have been summarized below in Table 3.

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

The proposed project would generate approximately 339 daily vehicle trips as determined by the City Traffic Engineer. These trips would generate air emissions; however, the amount of emissions from the estimated vehicle trips would not be sufficient to create or significantly

contribute towards violations of air quality standards. Therefore, emissions associated with the occupancy of the proposed subdivision would be less than significant.

Table 3
AVAQMD Air Quality Thresholds

Criteria Pollutant	Daily Threshold (Pounds)	Annual Threshold (Tons)
Oxides of Nitrogen (NO _x)	137	25
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)	137	25
Oxides of Sulfur (SO _x)	137	25
Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	82	15
Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	65	12
Hydrogen Sulfide (H ₂ S)	54	10
Lead (Pb)	3	0.6

- c. The closest sensitive receptors are single-family residences immediately to the east of the project site, as well as Sundown Elementary School located approximately 0.2 miles northeast of the project site. The trips associated with the proposed project would generate emissions; however, the amount of traffic generated by the project is not sufficient enough to significantly impact nearby intersections or roadways and create or contribute considerably to violations of air quality standards on either a localized or regional basis. Therefore, substantial pollutant concentrations would not occur and impacts would be less than significant.

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 Measure 10 (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 on 65th Street West. Most objectionable odors are typically associated with industrial projects involving the use of chemicals, solvents, petroleum products and other strong-smelling elements used in manufacturing processes, as well as sewage treatment facilities and landfills. These types of uses are not part of the proposed project. Odors may also

be generated by typical residential activities (e.g., cooking, etc.). However, these odors are considered to be normal odors associated with residential development and less than significant. Therefore, impacts associated with odors would be less than significant.

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

- a. A biological resources survey was conducted for the project site by Mark Hagan and documented in a report entitled "Biological Resource Assessment of APN 3203-018-114, Lancaster, California" dated September 13, 2019.

A survey of the project site was conducted on September 11, 2019 by walking a total of eight line transects in a north-south direction. These transects were spaced approximately 33 feet apart and each one was 1,320 feet in length. During the surveys, all plants and animal species detected

were recorded. A total of 26 plant species and 24 animal species were identified. These species are listed in Tables 4 and 5, respectively.

**Table 4
 Observed Plant Species**

Great basin sagebrush (<i>Artemisia tridentata</i>)	Rabbit brush (<i>Chrysothamnus nauseosus</i>)	Four-wing saltbush (<i>Atriplex canescens</i>)
Foxtail barley (<i>Hordeum leporinum</i>)	Nevada saltbush (<i>Atriplex torreyi</i>)	Fiddleneck (<i>Amsinckia tessellata</i>)
Angle-stem buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum angulosum</i>)	Spotted buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum maculatum</i>)	Desert straw (<i>Stephanomeria pauciflora</i>)
Turkey mullein (<i>Eremocarpus setigerus</i>)	Jimson weed (<i>Datura meteloides</i>)	Rattlesnake weed (<i>Euphorbia albomarginata</i>)
Pineapple weed (<i>Trichostema lanceolatum</i>)	Black-eyed susan (<i>Rudbeckia hirta</i>)	Red stemmed filaree (<i>Erodium cicutarium</i>)
Narrow-leaved milkweed (<i>Asclepias fascicularis</i>)	Russian knapweed (<i>Rhaponticum repens</i>)	Annual burweed (<i>Franseria acanthicarpa</i>)
Tumble mustard (<i>Sisymbrium altissimum</i>)	Russian thistle (<i>Salsola iberica</i>)	Horehound (<i>Marrubium vulgare</i>)
Cheatgrass (<i>Bromus tectorum</i>)	Red brome (<i>Bromus rubens</i>)	Shadscale (<i>Atriplex confertifolia</i>)
Schismus (<i>Schismus</i> sp.)	Vinegar weed (<i>Trichostema lanceolatum</i>)	

**Table 5
 Observed Animal Species**

Rodents (Order: Rodentia)	Kangaroo rat (<i>Dipodomys</i> sp.)	Coyote (<i>Canis latrans</i>)
Domestic dog (<i>Canis familiaris</i>)	Common raven (<i>Corvus corax</i>)	Sheep (<i>Ovis</i> sp.)
Desert cottontail (<i>Sylvilagus auduboni</i>)	California quail (<i>Callipepla californica</i>)	Mourning dove (<i>Zenaida macroura</i>)
Black-tailed jackrabbit (<i>Lepus californicus</i>)	Northern mockingbird (<i>Mimus polyglottos</i>)	Horned lark (<i>Eremophila alpestris</i>)
House finch (<i>Carpodacus mexicanus</i>)	Side blotched lizard (<i>Uta stansburiana</i>)	Harvester ants (Order: Hymenoptera)
Bee, small (Order: Hymenoptera)	European honey bee (Order: Hymenoptera)	Wasp, orange abdomen (Order: Hymenoptera)
Grasshopper (Order: Orthoptera)	Spider (Order: Araneida)	Paper wasp (Family: Vespidae)
Cabbage white butterfly (<i>Pieris rapae</i>)	Dragonfly (Order: Odonata)	Western pygmy-blue (<i>Brephidium exile</i>)

No sensitive or special status plant or animal species were observed during the surveys. No burrowing owls, their sign or potential cover sites were observed during the surveys. Based on the habitat, lack of cover sites and information from the CNDDDB, burrowing owls are not

expected and no mitigation measures are necessary. Additionally, there is no habitat on site for Mojave ground squirrels, desert tortoises or Swainson's hawk and no Joshua trees are present. However, some of the shrubs on site could provide habitat for nesting birds. In order to ensure that any impacts to nesting birds are less than significant, the following mitigation measure is required. With implementation of the identified mitigation measure, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

2. 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.
- b. The project site does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Therefore, no impact would occur.
 - c. There are no State or federally protected wetlands on the project site as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
 - d. The project site is not part of an established migratory wildlife corridor. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
 - e. The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances, such as a tree preservation policy, protecting biological resources. The proposed project would be subject to the requirements of Ordinance No. 848, Biological Impact Fee, which requires the payment of \$770/acre to 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 Historical, Environmental, Archaeological, Research, Team (H.E.A.R.T.) and documented in a report entitled “A Phase I Archaeological Study for Tentative Tract Map #82777 (APN 3203-018-114), A 10-acre parcel on the Southwest corner of 65th Street West between Avenue J-8 and Avenue J-12, City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California” and dated August 2019. The report included a review of historical information, records search, and field surveys.

Based on the records search, a previous survey of the project site was conducted and identified a prehistoric camp site with a historic refuse deposit (CA-LAN-2099/H). A Phase II archaeological study of this site was conducted and both components of the site were determined to be not significant under CEQA and no further work or mitigation measures were recommended.

A field survey of the project site was conducted on August 31, 2019. This survey reconfirmed the presence of the previously recorded site but no other cultural resources were encountered. No human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, were identified on the project site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

While no specific tribal or cultural resources were identified during the AB 52 process, the Femandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians and the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation have identified the area as culturally sensitive and have requested mitigation measures to be included in the event that previously unknown resources are discovered during construction activities and to ensure that a tribal monitor is present during ground disturbing activities. These mitigation measures have been included. With incorporation of the mitigation measures, impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

3. The applicant shall retain a professional Native American monitor procured by the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians to observe all clearing, grubbing, and grading

operations within the proposed impact areas. If cultural resources are encountered, the Native American monitor will have the authority to request that ground-disturbing activities cease within 60 feet of discovery to assess and document potential finds in real time. One monitor will be required on-site for all ground-disturbing activities in areas designated through additional consultation. However, if ground-disturbing activities occur in more than one of the designated monitoring areas at the same time, then the parties can mutually agree to an additional monitor, to ensure that simultaneously occurring ground-disturbing activities receive thorough levels of monitoring coverage.

4. In the event that cultural resources are discovered during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) shall cease and a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall assess the find. Work on the portions of the project outside of the buffered area may continue during this assessment period. Additionally, the Fernandeano Tataviam Band of Mission Indians and the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation (YSMN) Cultural Resources Department 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.
5. The applicant shall, in good faith, consult with the Fernandeano Tataviam Band of Mission Indians and the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation on the disposition and treatment of any Tribal Cultural Resource encountered during all ground disturbing activities.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. The Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation Cultural Resources Department (YSMN) shall be contacted if any pre-contact and/or historic- era cultural resources discovered during project implementation, and be provided information regarding the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment. Should the find be deemed significant, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), a cultural resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan shall be created by the archaeologist, in coordination with YSMN, and all subsequent finds shall be subject to this Plan. This Plan shall allow for a monitor to be present that represents YSMN for the remainder of the project, should YSMN elect to place a monitor on-site.
9. Any and all archaeological/cultural documents created as a part of the project (isolate records, site records, survey reports, testing reports, etc.) shall be supplied to the applicant and Lead

Agency for dissemination to YSMN. The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with YSMN throughout the life of the project.

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

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

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

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

resources, which are naturally replenished within a human timescale such as sunlight, wind, tides, waves, and geothermal heat.

The 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 previous standards went into effect on January 1, 2017 and January 1, 2020 and substantially reduced electricity and natural gas consumption. Additional savings result from the application of the standards on building alterations such as cool roofs, lighting, and air distribution ducts.

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

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

The City of Lancaster adopted the Zero Net Energy (ZNE) Home Ordinance in February 2017. The ZNE Ordinance mandates all builders to install a solar system equal to two watts per square foot for each home built. Developers have three options available to comply with the City's ZNE requirement: a solar component, mitigation fees in lieu of a solar component, or a combination of both. The houses constructed as a result of the proposed project would comply with all of these regulations and would not conflict or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. This ordinance was made obsolete when the CalGreen Code went into effect on January 1, 2020. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. <u>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</u> . Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X		
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			X	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X

- a. The project site is not identified as being in or in proximity to a fault rupture zone (LMEA Figure 2-5). According to the Seismic Hazard Evaluation of the Lancaster East and West Quadrangles, the project site may be subject to intense seismic shaking (LMEA pg. 2-16). However, the

proposed project would be constructed in accordance with the seismic requirements of the Uniform Building Code (UBC) adopted by the City, which would render any potential impacts to a less than significant level. The site is generally level and is not subject to landslides (SSHZ).

Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which the strength and stiffness of 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 following mitigation measure shall be required to control dust/wind erosion.

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

Mitigation Measures

- 10. The applicant shall submit the required Construction Excavation Fee to the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) prior to the issuance of any grading and/or construction permits. This includes compliance with all prerequisites outlined in District Rule 403, Fugitive Dust, including submission and approval of a Dust Control Plan, installation of signage and the completion of a successful onsite compliance inspection by an AVAQMD field inspector. Proof of compliance shall be submitted to the City.
- c. Subsidence is the sinking of the soil caused by the extraction of water, petroleum, etc. Subsidence can result in geologic hazards known as fissures. Fissures are typically associated with faults or groundwater withdrawal, which results in the cracking of the ground surface. According to Figure 2-3 of the City of Lancaster's Master Environmental Assessment, the project site is not known to be within an area subject to fissuring, sinkholes, or subsidence or any other form of geologic unit or soil instability. The closest sinkholes and fissures are located along Avenue I and 60th Street West approximately 1.5 miles northeast of the project site. For a discussion of potential impacts regarding liquefaction, please refer to Section Item VII.a. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- d. The soil on the project site is characterized by a low shrink/swell potential (LMEA Figure 2-3). A soils report for the proposed project shall be submitted to the City by the project developer prior to grading and the recommendations of the report shall be incorporated into the development of the proposed project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- e. The proposed project would be tied into the sanitary sewer system. No septic or alternative means of waste water disposal are part of the proposed project. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- f. The proposed project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or geologic feature. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

- a. The proposed project consists of a 36-lot residential subdivision. As discussed in Item III.b., the proposed project would generate air emissions during construction and operational activities, some of which may be greenhouse gases. These emissions are anticipated to be less than the thresholds established by AVAQMD due to the size of the project and therefore would not prevent the State from reaching its greenhouse gas reduction targets. Once the development is operational, it would generate emissions, primarily from vehicles and other activities associated with the residential uses, including yard maintenance, heating/cooling maintenance, etc. however, the development would require to comply with the requirements of the City's Net Zero Energy Ordinance, Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance, and other requirements which increase the efficiency of buildings and reduce air emissions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The proposed project would be in compliance with the greenhouse gas goals and polices identified in the City of Lancaster General Plan (LMEA p.7-2 to 7-15) and in the City's adopted Climate Action Plan. Therefore, impacts with respect to conflicts with an agency's plans, policies, and regulations would be less than significant.

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

a-b. The proposed project consists of a 36-lot residential subdivision. Typical construction materials would be utilized during development of the subdivision. Occupants of the subdivision would typically utilize household cleaners (e.g., cleanser, bleach, etc.), fertilizer, and potentially limited use of common pesticides. These uses would be similar to other residential development in the area. The proposed project is not located along a hazardous materials transportation corridor (LMEA p. 9.1-14 and Figure 9.1-4). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c. The project site is located within a mile of an existing or proposed school. The closest school to the project site is Sundown Elementary School, located approximately 0.2 miles to the northeast. While a school is located within 0.2 miles of the project site, the proposed project would not generate hazardous emissions or handle hazardous/ acutely hazardous materials. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- d. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for the proposed project by Arrow Engineering Services, Inc. The results of the study are documented in a report entitled "Phase I Environmental Assessment for Potential Hazardous Materials/ Waste Contamination, Avenue J-8 & 65th Street West, APN 3203-018-114, Los Angeles County, California" and dated October 4, 2019.

As part of the environmental site assessment, a site visit was conducted on September 16, 2019. The subject site is vacant and no buildings are on the subject site. No hazardous materials/waste were observed at the subject site. No evidence of environmental concerns, including hazardous material disposal, sewage discharge, wells, septic systems, underground or above ground (UST/AST) storage tanks, or stressed vegetation, was observed on the project site.

In addition to the site visit, a regulatory records review was conducted for the project site. The project site and the surrounding properties are not located in any hazardous materials databases. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

- e. The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan. The nearest airfield, General William Fox Airfield, is located approximately 3.5 miles northeast of the project site. There are no circumstances related to this proximity that could be expected to result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area, therefore no impacts would occur.
- f. The traffic generated by the proposed project is not expected to block the roadways. Improvements that have been conditioned as part of the project would ensure that traffic operates smoothly. Therefore, the proposed project would not impair or physically block any identified evacuation routes and would not interfere with any adopted emergency response plan. Impacts would not occur.
- g. With the exception of the property to the east, the surrounding properties are vacant and undeveloped. It is possible that these properties could be subject to grass fires. The project site is also located approximately 1.4 miles from Los Angeles County Fire Station No. 84, located at 5030 Avenue L-14, which would serve the project site in the event of a fire. Therefore, potential impacts from wildland fires would be less than significant.

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

- a. The project site is not located in an area with an open body of water or in an aquifer recharge area. The proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable provisions of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. The NPDES program establishes a comprehensive storm water quality program to manage urban storm water and

minimize pollution of the environment to the maximum extent practicable. The reduction of pollutants in urban storm water discharge through the use of structural and nonstructural Best Management Practices (BMPs) is one of the primary objectives of the water quality regulations. BMPs that are typically used to 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 36 single-family residential lots. Single family residences are not a use that would normally generate wastewater that violates water quality standards or exceeds waste discharge requirements. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- b. The proposed project would not include any groundwater wells or pumping activities. All water supplied to the proposed project would be obtained from Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- c. Development the proposed project would increase the amount of surface runoff as a result of impervious surfaces associated with the grading of the site. 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 site. Therefore, impacts from drainage and runoff would be less than significant.

The project site is designated as Flood Zone X-Shaded per the Flood Insurance Rate Map (06037C0415F). Flood Zone X-Shaded is located outside of the 100-year flood zone but within 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 other large bodies of water. Therefore, the proposed project would not be subject to inundation by seiches or mudflows. No impacts would occur.
- e. The proposed project would not conflict or obstruct the implementation of the applicable water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. For additional information see responses X.a through X.c. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- a. The proposed project consists of the construction and occupancy of a 36-lot residential subdivision. The project site is located at the southwest corner of 65th Street West and Avenue J-8 on vacant land. The proposed project would not block a public street, trail, other access route, or result in a physical barrier that would divide the community. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- b. The proposed project is consistent with the City’s General Plan and must be in conformance with the Lancaster Municipal Code. The proposed project will be in compliance with the City-adopted Uniform Building Code (UBC) and erosion control requirements (Section VII). Additionally, as noted Section IV, the project site is not subject to and would not conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

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

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

- a. The City's General Plan (Table 3-1) establishes an outdoor maximum CNEL of 65 dBA for residential uses. Table 8-11 of the LMEA provides the existing roadway noise levels adjacent to the project site. The current noise levels in the vicinity of the project site range from 53.7 dBA to 60.8 dBA. These noise levels are consistent with the standards of the General Plan. While this noise level is consistent with the standards of the General Plan additional features of the proposed project (e.g., landscaping, block walls, etc.) would ensure that the project remains in compliance with the General Plan. Therefore, potential noise impacts associated with traffic from the proposed development and operational activities would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation Measures

11. Construction operations shall not occur between 8 p.m. and 7 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday or at any time on Sunday. The hours of any construction-related activities shall be restricted to periods and days permitted by local ordinance.
 12. The on-site construction supervisor shall have the responsibility and authority to receive and resolve noise complaints. A clear appeal process to the owner shall be established prior to construction commencement that will allow for resolution of noise problems that cannot be immediately solved by the site supervisor.
 13. Electrically powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, where feasible.
 14. Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking and maintenance areas shall be located as far away as practicable from noise-sensitive receptors.
 15. The use of noise producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells shall be for safety warning purposes only.
 16. No project-related public address or music system shall be audible at any adjacent receptor. All noise producing construction equipment and vehicles using internal combustion engines shall be equipped with mufflers, air-inlet silencers where appropriate, and any other shrouds, shields, or other noise-reducing features in good operating condition that meet or exceed original factor specifications. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors, etc.) shall be equipped with shrouds and noise control features that are readily available for the type of equipment.
- b. It is not anticipated that the grading of the proposed project would require the use of machinery that generates ground-borne vibration as no major subsurface construction (e.g., parking garage) is planned. No ground mounted industrial-type equipment that generates ground vibration would be utilized once the project is constructed and operational. Therefore, no impacts associated with ground-borne vibration/noise are anticipated.
- c. The project site is not in proximity to an airport or a frequent overflight area and would not experience noise from these sources. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

- a. The proposed project would result in an incremental increase in population growth; however, this increase was anticipated in both the City's General Plan and in the Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG's) most recent Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). Additionally, while it is likely that individuals involved in the construction of the proposed project or residing at the proposed project would come from the Antelope Valley any increase in population would contribute, on an incremental basis, to the population of the City. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The project site is currently vacant. No housing or people would be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

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

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

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

a-b. The proposed project would generate additional population growth and would contribute on an incremental basis to the use of the existing park and recreational facilities. The project is proposed to include the subdivision of 36 single-family residential lots. However, the applicant would be required to pay park fees which would offset the impacts of the existing parks. The development of the proposed project would not require the construction of new recreational facilities or the expansion of existing ones. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

- a. The proposed project would not conflict with or impede any of the General Plan policies or specific actions related to alternative modes of transportation (Lancaster General Plan pgs. 5-18 to 5-24.) Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- b. In July 2020, the City of Lancaster adopted standards and thresholds for analyzing projects with respect to vehicle miles traveled (VMT). A series of screening criteria were adopted and if a project meets one of these criteria, a VMT analysis is not required. These criteria are: 1) project site - generates fewer than 110 trips per day; 2) locally serving retail - commercial developments of 50,000 square feet or smaller; 3) project located in a low VMT area- 15% below baseline; 4) transit proximity; 5) affordable housing; and 6) transportation facilities. The proposed project is does not meet any of the screening criteria and a VMT analysis was conducted for the project site by Fehr and Peers titled "Lancaster TTM 82777 VMT Analysis" and is dated July 13, 2022.

The VMT Analysis indicated that the proposed project needs to reduce its VMT by 986 in order to be 15% below the established thresholds adopted by the City of Lancaster. The report also indicated that physical improvements to mitigate these VMT were not readily available.

However, on January 24, 2023, the City of Lancaster City Council adopted the Vehicle Miles Traveled Impact Fee Mitigation Program and certified the accompanying Final Program Environmental Impact Report, findings, and statement of overriding considerations. The VMT mitigation program allows developers to pay \$150 per VMT to mitigate their VMT impacts and tier off of the Program EIR. With payment of the fee, the proposed project's VMT impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

17. The proposed project shall pay the City's Vehicle Miles Traveled Impact Fee Mitigation fee prior to the issuance of any construction related permits in accordance with the adopted program and certified Program EIR. The fee is \$150 per VMT for a total of \$147,900.
- c. Street improvements are required as part of the conditions of approval and would ensure that traffic flows smoothly in the vicinity of the project site. No hazardous conditions would be created by these improvements. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- d. The project site would have adequate emergency access from 65th Street West. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

- a. No cultural resources were identified on the project site through either the records search or the on-site survey that was conducted. One previously known site was reconfirmed; however, it had previously been determined to not be significant under CEQA. No specific tribal cultural resources were identified during the AB 52 process; however, the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians and the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation both identified the project site as being within a culturally sensitive area. Mitigation measures were requested to ensure the proper handling of any previously unknown cultural resources encountered during construction and for a tribal monitor. 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 into the existing utilities such as electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, telecommunications, etc. These services already exist in the general area. Connections would occur on the project site or within existing roadways or right-of-way. Connections to these utilities are assumed as part of the proposed project and impacts to environmental resources have been discussed throughout the document. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 has not indicated any problems in supplying water to the proposed project from existing facilities. No new construction of water treatment or new or expanded entitlements would be required. Therefore, water impacts would be less than significant.

- c. The proposed project would discharge to a local sewer line, which is not maintained by the Districts, for conveyance to the Districts' Avenue J West Trunk Sewer, located in Avenue J at 60th Street West. According to the letter dated November 27, 2019 from the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles (LACSD), this 36-inch diameter trunk sewer has a design capacity of 15.9 million gallons per day (mgd) and conveyed a peak flow of 1.2 mgd when last measured in 2018. The project's wastewater would be treated at the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant upon connection which has a design capacity of 18 mgd and currently processes an average recycled water flow of 14.3 mgd. The expected average wastewater flow from the proposed project is 9,360 gallons per day. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- d-e. Solid waste generated within the City limits is generally disposed of at the Lancaster Landfill located at 600 East Avenue F. This landfill is a Class III landfill which accepts agricultural, nonfriable asbestos, construction/demolition waste, contaminated soil, green materials, industrial, inert, mixed municipal, sludge, and waste tires. It does not accept hazardous materials. Assembly Bill (AB) 939 was adopted in 1989 and required a 25% diversion of solid waste from landfills by 1995 and a 50% diversion by 2005. In 2011, AB 341 was passed which requires the State to achieve a 75% reduction in solid waste by 2030. The City of Lancaster also requires all developments to have trash collection services in accordance with City contracts with waste haulers over the life of the proposed project. These collection services would also collect recyclable materials and organics. The trash haulers are required to be in compliance with applicable regulations on solid waste transport and disposal, including waste stream reduction mandated under AB 341.

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

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

a. See Item IX.f.

b-d. The project 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. 84, located at 5030 Avenue L-14, which can adequately serve the project site. Other fire stations are also located in close proximity to the project site which can provide service if needed. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

	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. The proposed project consists of the subdivision of approximately 10 acres into 36 individual lots for single family residences in the R-7,000 zone. Other projects have been submitted within approximately one mile of the project site (Table 6). These projects are also required to be in accordance with the City's zoning code and General Plan. Cumulative impacts are the change in the environment, which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects.

The proposed project would not create any impacts with respect to: Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Energy, 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, Noise, and Transportation. Impacts associated with these issues are less than significant with the incorporation of the identified mitigation measures. Many of the impacts generated by projects are site specific and generally do not influence the impacts on another site. All projects undergo environmental review and have required mitigation measures to reduce impacts when warranted. These mitigation measures

reduce environmental impacts to less than significant levels whenever possible. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

**Table 6
Related Projects List**

Case No.	Location	APNs	Description	Status
TTM No. 61920/ ZC No. 21-04	NEC 55 th St W & Ave K	3203-016-035, 036, 037	38.9-acre subdivision for 169 single family lots; zone change to R-7,000	Approved
TTM No. 71210/ ZC No. 22-01	Eastside of 55 th St W btw Ave K and Ave K-8	3204-010-054, 055, 062, 063; 3204-011-033, 034, 059	40.4-acre subdivision for 169 single family lots; zone change to R-7,000	Approved
TTM 66680	SEC and SWC of Ave K-8 and 55 th St W	3204-006-025, 026, 027, 031, 032, 033, 067, 071, 075, 081, 085, 088, 096	71.8-acre subdivision for 219 single family residential lots	Under Review
TTM No. 53642/ CUP No. 22-08	SEC 60 th St W and Ave K-4	3204-009-026, 079, 081	32.9-acre subdivision for a 218 lot, age-restricted residential planned development	Approved
TTM No. 83232/ Var No. 21-02	NWC 60 th St W and Ave K-12	3204-008-048	20-acre subdivision for 86 single family residential lots	Approved
TTM No. 73507/ SP No. 15-01 (Avanti North)	Bounded by Ave K, Ave K-8, 62 nd St W, 70 th St W	3204-002-126	238.25-acre specific plan for 873 single family residential lots and two parks	Approved
TTM No. 74312/ SP No. 15-02/ DA No. 18-01	Bounded by 62 nd St W, 75 th St W, Ave K-8, Ave L	3240-008-045, 047; 3204-001- 184, 195	307.7-acre specific plan for 1,375 single family residences, 325 multi-family units, parks, school, fire station, and commercial uses	Approved

List of Referenced Documents and Available Locations*:

BRR:	Biological Resource Assessment of APN 3203-018-114, Lancaster, California, Mark Hagan, September 13, 2019	DSD
CRS:	A Phase I Archaeological Study for Tentative Tract Map #82777 (APN 3203-018-114), A 10-acre parcel on the Southwest Corner of 65 th Street West, between Avenue J-8 and Avenue J-12, City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California; Historical, Environmental, Archaeological, Research Team (H.E.A.R.T), August 2019	DSD
ESA:	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for Potential Hazardous Materials/Waste Contamination, Avenue J-8 & 65 th Street West, Los Angeles County, California, Arrow Engineering Services, Inc., October 4, 2019	DSD
FIRM:	Flood Insurance Rate Map	DSD
GPEIR:	Lancaster General Plan Environmental Impact Report	DSD
LACSD:	Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County letter, November 27, 2019	DSD
LACW:		DSD
LGP:	Lancaster General Plan	DSD
LMC:	Lancaster Municipal Code	DSD
LMEA:	Lancaster Master Environmental Assessment	DSD
SSHZ:	State Seismic Hazard Zone Maps	DSD
TRA	Traffic CEQA Form, August 23, 2022	DSD
USGS:	United States Geological Survey Maps	DSD
USDA SCS:	United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Maps	DSD
VMT	Lancaster TTM 82777 VMT Analysis Study, Fehr and Peers, July 13, 2022	DSD

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