COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

CITY OF LANCASTER
INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

---

1. Project Title and File Number:	Site Plan Review No. 22-14 Lot Line Adjustment No. 23-004 L-4 Avenue Warehouse Industrial Park
2. Lead Agency Name and Address:	City of Lancaster Community Development Department 44933 Fern Avenue Lancaster, California 93534
3. Lead Agency Contact Person and Phone Number:	Jocelyn Swain, Senior Planner Community Development Department 661-723-6249
4. Location:	±10.56 acres Wall Street and Avenue L-4 APNs: 3128-007-015 and 3128-007-024
5. Applicant Name and Address:	L4 Industrial 10, LLC Michael DiSano 3 Corporate Plaza, Suite 230 Newport Beach, CA 92660
6. General Plan designation:	LI - Light Industrial
7. Zoning:	LI - Light Industrial

8. Description of Project:

The proposed project consists of an application for a Site Plan Review (SPR No. 22-14), and a Lot Line Adjustment (LLA) No. 23-004 to merge the two lots. SPR 22-14 would allow for the construction and operation of one building proposed for light industrial and general warehousing uses with a total building area of 217,700 square feet on an approximately 10.56-acre vacant property in the City of Lancaster, California. The proposed project also consists

of 0.57-acre to extend Avenue L-4 from the eastern boundary of the site to the western boundary of the site. The project site is generally located west of Sierra Highway, north of Avenue L-4, and south of Avenue L.

The building would have a total building area of 217,700 square feet, consisting of 215,200 square feet of warehouse space and 2,500 square feet of ground floor office space, with 28 dock doors positioned on the western façade of the building. The building would be constructed of concrete tilt-up panels and are proposed to be painted in shades of white and gray with blue accents. Blue glazing (glass) would occur at the southern façade building corners. The proposed building would have a variable roofline with a maximum height of approximately 46.6 feet. Other physical features include drive aisles, parking areas, truck courts, access gates, landscaping, a retention basin, lighting, screening walls, fencing, and signage.

Access to the building would be provided via two gated entrances extending from Avenue L-4. Parking lots for passenger vehicles are designed along the northern and eastern sides of the building and would provide a total of 122 passenger vehicle parking spaces including ADA accessible and electric vehicle (EV) charging spaces. Additional spaces for truck and trailer parking would be located along the western side of the building, and would provide a total of 38 trailer stalls. A retention basin is designed to be located along the western portion of the project site. Landscaping is proposed along the boundaries of the project site, along the building perimeters, and in the passenger vehicle parking areas and consists of a mixture of trees, shrubs, groundcover and accent plants.

The building is proposed on a speculative basis, meaning that the user of the building is not yet known. Operational characteristics assumed and that are typical of light industrial and general warehousing building operations include hours of operation extending to 24 hour per day, 7 days per week, vehicle movements in the drive aisles and parking areas, employee and visitor activity, and the loading and unloading of trailers at the loading docks located in the screened and secured truck court area.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

Under existing conditions, the project site is vacant undeveloped land. Table 1, *Zoning/Land Use Information*, identifies the existing uses, the land use designations, and the zoning classifications of lands immediately surrounding the project site as described below.

North: To the north of the project site is undeveloped land and a former UPS facility with a remaining truck storage area, beyond which is Avenue L.

South: To the south of the project site is undeveloped land. To the southwest is Avenue L-4 and commercial and industrial facilities including Precision Welding and Premier Window Tinting.

East: To the east of the project site is a truck storage facility and Green Valley Nursery, beyond which is Sierra Highway.

West: To the west of the project site is undeveloped land. (Google Maps, 2023)

Table 1 Zoning/Land Use Information

Direction	Existing Land Use	General Plan Land Use Designation	Zoning
North	Roadways/Undeveloped/Commercial	LI – Light Industrial	LI – Light Industrial
East	Roadway/Commercial/Truck Storage	LI – Light Industrial	LI – Light Industrial
South	Undeveloped land	LI – Light Industrial	LI – Light Industrial
West	Undeveloped land	LI – Light Industrial	LI – Light Industrial

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

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

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District
- Los Angeles County Fire Department
- Los Angeles County Sanitation District #14
- Los Angeles County Waterworks District #40
- 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 three individuals associated with three tribes which have requested to be included. These letters were mailed via certified return receipt mail and included copies of the site plan, grading plan, and cultural resources report. Table 2 identifies the tribes, the person to whom the letter was directed, and the date the letter was received.

The Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians responded to the letter and the requested mitigation measures have been included in the cultural resources section to address proper procedures in the event of that previously unknown cultural resources are discovered on the project site during construction.

Table 2 Tribal Notification

Tribe	Person/Title	Date Received
Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation	Andrew Salas/Chairman	October 31, 2022
Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation	Ryan Nordness/Cultural Resource Analyst	October 31, 2022
Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians	Sarah Brunzell, Manager, Cultural Resources Management Division	October 31, 2022

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below (x) would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact or "Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated " as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐	Aesthetics	☐	Agriculture / Forestry Resources	☒	Air Quality
☒	Biological Resources	☒	Cultural Resources	☐	Energy
☐	Geology/Soils	☐	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐	Hazards & Hazardous Materials
☐	Hydrology/Water Quality	☐	Land Use / Planning	☐	Mineral Resources
☐	Noise	☐	Population / Housing	☐	Public Services
☐	Recreation	☒	Transportation	☐	Tribal Cultural Resources
☐	Utilities /Service Systems	☐	Wildfire	☐	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 impact unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR)**is required, but it must analyze only 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 the 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

Signature

December 20, 2023

Date

Jocelyn Swain

Printed Name

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.

Environmental Analysis

I. AESTHETICS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and historic buildings with a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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 points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views of the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a. **No Impact.**

The *Lancaster General Plan 2030 Master Environmental Assessment* (*MEA*) identifies five scenic resources in the area: 1) Foothills Area; 2) Little Buttes; 3) Quartz Hill; 4) Piute Ponds; and 5) Little Rock Wash. Quartz Hill and Little Rock Wash are both located approximately 7 miles west and east of the project site, respectively, and are the closest scenic resources to the project site. Due to the distance from the project site and intervening topography, the scenic resources are not visible from the site. Scenic views of the desert are available throughout much of the immediately surrounding area and would not be impeded by implementation of the project. Long-range views of the rugged San Gabriel mountains to the south, the Sierra Pelonas to the southwest and west and the Tehachapi Mountains to the northwest, are available from the City and surrounding area, including the Antelope Valley freeway (City of Lancaster, 2009b. p. 12-1; Figure 12-1)(Google Earth, 2022). The project involves the construction of one building for light industrial and general warehouse use reaching 46.6 feet in height. Given the high elevations of the mountains in relation to the 46.6-foot building height, views of the mountains will remain available and the project has no reasonable potential to block mountain views. Implementation of the project would not impede views of the desert and the distant mountains from public viewpoints. Therefore, no impact would occur.

b. **No Impact.**

There are no State designated scenic highways in the City of Lancaster. (Caltrans, 2018). Therefore, the project has no potential to substantially damage scenic resources with a state scenic highway. Thus, no impact would occur.

c. **Less than Significant Impact**.

The Project site occurs within an urbanized area. The U.S. Census Bureau (UCSB) defines an "urbanized area" as a densely settled core of census tracts and/or census blocks that have 50,000 or more residents and meet minimum requirements while also being adjacent to areas containing non-residential urban land uses. The Project site is located within the boundaries of the Census-defined Lancaster-Palmdale urbanized area (USCB, 2010a) (USCB, 2010b). Because the Project site is located in an area that meets the USCB's definition of an "urbanized area" and is planned for urban uses by the City's General Plan, the evaluation herein focuses on the compatibility of the Project with, or potential conflict with, applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

The Project is consistent with the LI-Light Industrial land use and zoning designated by the City for the property and would be required to comply with all applicable LI zoning requirements addressing visual quality. Additionally, the City of Lancaster adopted Design Guidelines on December 8, 2009 (updated March 10, 2010). The guidelines provide the basis to achieve quality design for all development within the City. While development of the proposed project would change the character of the existing site, the proposed project would be compatible with surrounding uses. The proposed project would conform to design standards, the intent of the design guidelines, and would be compatible with nearby developments. City staff has reviewed the proposed project to ensure that elevations are consistent with the design guidelines and the City's vision for the community. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d. Less than Significant Impact.

Under existing conditions, the project site is vacant and undeveloped and thus contains no sources of artificial lighting or glare. Existing offsite streetlights are located along the developed portion of Avenue L-4 and ancillary lighting may flow onto the site from the existing truck storage facility and Green Valley Nursery located to the east of the project site. Additional existing lighting may emanate from the parking lot of the former UPS facility and the truck storage area located to the north of the site. New sources of lighting and glare would be introduced to the site as a result of implementation of the proposed project. The proposed project would transform the project site from a vacant undeveloped property to a developed property containing one building for light industrial and general warehouse use, which would be illuminated and have small elements of reflective building material such as window glass at the southeast and southwest corners of the building. Lighting on the project site would primarily be used to illuminate the parking areas, truck docking areas, and building entrances and be required to conform to the lighting standards outlined in the Lancaster Municipal Code (LMC). The building would be constructed of concrete tilt-up panels and blue reflective glazing. While window glazing has a potential to result in minor glare effects, such effects would not adversely affect daytime or nighttime views of any surrounding properties, including motorists on adjacent roadways, because the glass used by the project would be low-reflective. Office elements with large windows are proposed on the southeast corner of the building. Large windows are also proposed along the southwest corner. Other areas proposed for window glazing would be limited, as shown in the project's application materials. The roof of the proposed building would be constructed to accommodate the installation of solar panels. Because the solar panels would lay flat on the roofs and be positioned behind the parapets, it is not likely that the panels would result in substantial adverse glare effects. Therefore, because the proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, impacts would be less than significant.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a. **No Impact**.

According to information from the California Department of Conservation's (CDC's) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), the entire project site is designated as "Other Land." The CDC defines "Other Land" as "land which is not included in any other category with common examples including low density rural developments; brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing; confined livestock, poultry or aquaculture facilities; strip mines, borrow pits; and water bodies smaller than forty acres." Vacant and nonagricultural land surrounded on all sides by urban development and greater than 40 acres is mapped as "Other Land" (CDC, n.d.). Therefore, because the project site is not designated Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, the project would not convert any lands designated as Farmland to non-agricultural use. Thus, no impact would occur as a result of implementation of the project.

b. **No Impact**.

The Project site is zoned LI which does not allow for agricultural production.. According to the CDC, the project site is not located on land that is subject to a Williamson Act Contract. In addition, land adjacent to the project site is not zoned for agricultural use nor is it subject to a Williamson Act contract (CDC, n.d.). Because the project site is not zoned for agricultural use, does not abut land zoned for agricultural use, and does not contain land under a Williamson Act contract, no impact would occur as a result of implementation of the project.

c. **No Impact.**

The project site is zoned LI and is not located on lands designated as forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production by the City's General Plan. Additionally, none of the immediately surrounding properties are designated as forest lands or timberlands. Therefore, implementation of the project would have no potential to conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code (PRC) §12220(g)), timberland (as defined by PRC §4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code §51104(g)). As such, no impact to forest lands or timberlands would occur as a result of implementation of the project.

d. **No Impact.**

The project site is not located on or near forest land. The project site is vacant, undeveloped land that is characterized by scrub-shrub vegetation with areas of disturbance. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of any forest land or convert forest land to non-forest use. As such, no impact to forest land would occur as a result of implementation of the project.

e. **No Impact.**

The project site is not located on or near lands designated as Farmland, forest land or timberland. As such, the proposed project has no potential to involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use, or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact to Farmland, forest land or timberland would occur as a result of implementation of the project.

III. Air Quality

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

a. **Less than Significant Impact**.

An Air Quality Impact Analysis (AQIA) and a Mobile Source Health Risk Assessment (HRA) were prepared for the Project by Urban Crossroads, included as *Technical Appendix A1* (Urban Crossroads, 2023a) and *Technical Appendix A2* (Urban Crossroads, 2023b), respectively.. The project site is located within the Mojave Desert Air Basin (MDAB) under the jurisdiction of the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD), which is responsible for bringing air quality in areas under its jurisdiction into conformity with federal and state air quality standards (Urban Crossroads, 2023a, p. 11). Currently, State and federal ambient air quality standards are exceeded in most parts of the MDAB. In response, the AVAQMD has adopted a series of Air Quality Management Plans (AQMPs) to meet the State and federal ambient air quality standards. AQMPs are updated regularly in order to more effectively reduce emissions, accommodate growth, and to minimize any negative fiscal impacts of air pollution control on the economy. (Urban Crossroads, 2023a, p. 27). The Federal Particulate Matter Attainment Plan and Ozone Attainment Plan for the Antelope Valley set forth a comprehensive set of programs that will lead the MDAB into compliance with federal and State air quality standards. The control measures and related emission reduction estimates within the Federal Particulate Matter Attainment Plan and Ozone Attainment Plan are based upon emissions projections for a future development scenario derived from land use, population, and employment characteristics defined in consultation with local governments. The project's consistency with these attainment plans is determined by demonstrating compliance with the criteria discussed below. (Urban Crossroads, 2023a, p. 44)

Consistency Criterion No. 1: Consistency Criterion No. 1 refers to local land use plans and/or population projects. The City of Lancaster designates the project site for LI land uses. The LI designation provides for "clean, non-polluting industrial and office uses with support commercial." The project proposes land uses consistent with the development anticipated under the General Plan land use designation. Therefore, the project would conform to local land use policies and therefore, would be consistent with Criterion No. 1. (Urban Crossroads, 2023a, p. 45)

Consistency Criterion No. 2: Consistency Criterion No. 2 refers to compliance with AVAQMD rules and regulations. The project would be required to comply with all applicable AVAQMD rules and regulations, including but not limited to, Rule 401 (Visible Emissions), Rule 402 (Nuisance) and Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust). Additionally, the project would implement a best available control measure related to Rule 1113 (Architectural Coatings). Therefore, the project would be consistent with Criterion No. 2. (Urban Crossroads, 2023a, p. 45)

Consistency Criterion No. 3: Consistency Criterion No. 3 refers to demonstrating that the project will not increase the frequency of a violation in the federal or state ambient air quality standards. The project construction and operational source emissions would not exceed applicable AVAQMD regional thresholds. Thus, the project would not have the potential to increase the frequency or severity of a violation of the federal or State ambient air quality standards for on-going project operations. Therefore, the project would be consistent with Criterion No. 3. (Urban Crossroads, 2023a, p. 45)

As demonstrated above, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. The proposed project is consistent with the land use and growth intensities reflected in the City's General Plan. Furthermore, the project would not exceed applicable regional or local thresholds. As such, the project would be consistent with the AQMP. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

b. **Less than Significant Impact**.

The proposed project has the potential to generate air pollutant concentrations during construction and operational activities. There are numerous requirements that development projects must comply with by law that are put in place by federal, State, and local regulatory agencies for the improvement of air quality. The two most pertinent regulatory requirements that apply to the proposed project and which are required by AVAQMD Rules that are currently applicable during construction activity for this project include, but are not limited to, Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) and Rule 1113 (Architectural Coatings). Project compliance with these and other mandatory regulatory requirements were assumed in the project's AQIA and herein. (Urban Crossroads, 2023a, pp. 1-3)

Impact Analysis for Construction Emissions

The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) was used to calculate expected project-related air pollutant emissions. CalEEMod accounts for the implementation and enforcement of California's progressively more restrictive regulatory requirements for construction equipment and the ongoing replacement of older construction fleet equipment with newer, less-polluting equipment. Thus, according to the CalEEMod, construction activities that occur in the near future are expected to generate more air pollutant emissions than the same activities that may occur farther into the future. For analysis purposes, construction is assumed to commence in Year 2023 and be completed in Year 2024. The construction schedule utilized in the analysis represents a "worst-case" analysis scenario should construction occur any time after the respective dates since emission factors for construction decrease as time passes and the analysis year increases due to emission regulations becoming more stringent. (Urban Crossroads, 2023a, pp. 36-37)

CalEEMod calculates maximum daily emissions for summer and winter periods. The calculated maximum daily emissions associated with project construction are presented in Table 3, *Emissions Summary of Construction – Without Mitigation.* As shown in Table 3, emissions resulting from the project construction would not exceed criteria pollutant thresholds established by the AVAQMD for emissions of any criteria pollutant. (Urban Crossroads, 2023a, p. 38) Accordingly, the project would not emit substantial concentrations of these pollutants during construction and would not contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, on a direct or

cumulatively-considerable basis. Impacts associated with construction-related emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs,) nitrogen oxides (NO_X), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur oxides (SO_X), fine particulate matter 10 microns in diameter or less (PM_{10}), and particulate matters 2.5 microns in diameter or less ($PM_{2.5}$) would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Table 3 Emissions Summary of Construction – Without Mitigation

Year	Emissions (lbs/day)					
	VOC	**NO_X**	**CO**	**SO_X**	**PM_{10}**	**$PM_{2.5}$**
Summer						
2023	1.01	20.20	38.50	0.06	6.02	2.85
2024	28.30	20.60	42.30	0.05	2.13	0.68
Winter						
2023	0.91	12.00	24.30	0.04	14.57	0.46
2024	28.20	20.70	38.10	0.05	2.13	0.68
Maximum Daily Emissions	**28.30**	**20.70**	**42.30**	**0.06**	**6.02**	**2.85**
AVAQMD Regional Threshold	137	137	548	137	82	65
Threshold Exceeded?	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**

Source: CalEEMod construction-source (unmitigated) emissions are presented in Appendix 3.1 of the Project's AQIA. (Urban Crossroads, 2023a, Table 3-4)

Impact Analysis for Operational Emissions

Based on the size, scale, and intended use of the proposed building, the expected operational characteristics of the future building user(s) are expected to generate air pollutant emissions from application of architectural coatings, use of consumer products, landscape maintenance activities, and the operation of motor vehicles (including cars and trucks) (Urban Crossroads, 2023a, pp. 39-40).

Long-term operational emissions associated with the project are presented in Table 4, *Summary of Peak Operational Emissions.* Detailed operational model outputs are presented in Appendix 3.2 of the project's AQIA and the analysis methodology is explained in the AQIA. As summarized in Table 4, project operational source emissions would not exceed the AVAQMD regional thresholds of significance for any criteria pollutants. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. (Urban Crossroads, 2023a, pp. 40-41)

Table 4 Summary of Peak Operational Emissions

Source	Emissions (lbs/day)					
	VOC	**NO_X**	**CO**	**SO_X**	**PM_{10}**	**$PM_{2.5}$**
Summer						
Mobile Source	1.96	11.05	17.60	0.12	2.56	0.67
Area Source	6.58	0.08	9.47	0.00	0.01	0.01
On-Site Equipment Source	0.12	0.38	16.44	0.00	0.03	0.03
Total Maximum Daily Emissions	**8.66**	**11.51**	**43.51**	**0.12**	**2.60**	**0.71**

AVAQMD Regional Threshold	137	137	548	137	82	65
Threshold Exceeded?	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**
Winter						
Mobile Source	1.89	14.48	15.80	0.15	3.12	0.82
Area Source	5.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
On-Site Equipment Source	0.12	0.38	16.44	0.00	0.03	0.03
Total Maximum Daily Emissions	**7.04**	**14.86**	**32.24**	**0.15**	**3.15**	**0.85**
AVAQMD Regional Threshold	137	137	548	137	82	65
Threshold Exceeded?	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**

Source: CalEEMod operational-source emissions are presented in Appendix 3.2 of the Project's AQIA.
(Urban Crossroads, 2023a, Table 3-7)

The AVAQMD relies on the SCAQMD guidance for determining cumulative impacts. SCAQMD considers air pollutant emissions that exceed the direct project-level thresholds to also be cumulatively considerable. Conversely, if a project does not exceed the direct project-level thresholds then SCAQMD considers the project's air pollutant emissions to be less than cumulatively considerable. Individual projects that do not generate operational or construction emissions that exceed the AVAQMD's recommended daily thresholds for project-specific impacts would also not cause a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment, and, therefore, would not be considered to have a significant, adverse air quality impact. Conversely, individual project-related construction and operational emissions that exceed AVAQMD thresholds for project-specific impacts would be considered cumulatively considerable. The evaluation of project-specific air pollutant emissions presented above demonstrates that the project would not exceed the applicable AVAQMD regional threshold for construction and operational-source emissions. (Urban Crossroads, 2023a, pp. 49-50) Therefore, the project's air pollutant emissions would be less than cumulatively considerable and would not contribute to the non-attainment of applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.**

For the protection of public health and welfare, the Clean Air Act requires that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) establish National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for various pollutants. These pollutants are referred to as "criteria" pollutants because the EPA publishes criteria documents to justify the choice of standards for each pollutant. These standards define the maximum amount of an air pollutant that can be present in ambient air without harm to the public's health. An ambient air quality standard is generally specified as a concentration averaged over a specific time period, such as one hour, eight hours, 24 hours, or one year. The different averaging times and concentrations are meant to protect against different exposure effects. The Clean Air Act allows states to adopt additional or more health-protective standards and California has adopted California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). In general, criteria pollutants have adverse effects to human health including, but not limited to, respiratory illness, cardiovascular impairment, and carcinogenic effects. (Urban Crossroads, 2023a, p. 12)

As background on existing pollution burden, the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) reports census tract demographic and socioeconomic data across the State of California and correlates that data with community health indicators. Even though the data is several years old and air quality has improved since the

data was reported, for informational reporting purposes, the census tract containing the Project site (Census Tract 6037900704) is reported by CalEPA's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) using the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen 4.0) ranks in the 47th percentile of communities that are disproportionately burdened by multiple sources of pollution (OEHHA, 2023).

The Project site is not located in a SB 535 Disadvantaged Community identified by the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA). The State provides California Climate Investment funding appropriated by the State Legislature from the proceeds of the State's Cap-and-Trade Program for investment in disadvantaged communities. The funding is used for programs that reduce emissions of greenhouse gases with at least 25% of the funding going to projects that provide a benefit to disadvantaged communities and at least 10 percent of the funding going to projects located within those communities (CalEPA, 2023).

The Project would not result in potentially adverse CO concentrations or "hot spots." Further, detailed modeling of Project-specific CO "hot spots" is not needed to reach this conclusion. An adverse CO concentration, known as a "hot spot," would occur if an exceedance of the State one-hour standard of 20 ppm or the eight-hour standard of 9 ppm were to occur. At the time of the 1993 Handbook, the MDAB was designated nonattainment under the CAAQS and NAAQS for CO. (Urban Crossroads, 2023a, p. 42)

The following provides an analysis of the project's potential to expose sensitive receptors in the immediate vicinity of the project site to substantial pollutant concentrations during project construction and operation based on the applicable significance thresholds established by the AVAQMD. The AVAQMD recommends that the nearest sensitive receptor be considered when determining the project's potential to cause an individual and cumulatively significant impact. Sensitive receptors include uses such as long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, and athletic facilities. The nearest receptors to the project site including non-sensitive and sensitive receptors are described below. All distances are measured from the project site boundary to the outdoor living areas (e.g., private backyards) or at the building façade, whichever is closer to the project site. (Urban Crossroads, 2023a, p. 46)

- R1: Location R1 represents the existing residence at 42735 2nd Street E, approximately 1,688 feet northeast of the project site. Since there are no private outdoor living areas facing the project site, receptor R1 is placed at the building façade.
- R2: Location R2 represents the existing residence at 42616 2nd Street E, approximately 1,802 feet east of the project site. Since there are no private outdoor living areas facing the project site, receptor R2 is placed at the building façade.
- R3: Location R3 represents the existing residential use located at 225 Avenue L-9, approximately 1,309 feet south of the project site. Since there are no private outdoor living areas facing the project site, receptor R3 is placed at the building façade.
- R4: Location R4 represents the existing Montecito Apartments located at 835 Avenue L, approximately 2,848 feet northwest of the project site. Since there are no private outdoor living areas facing the project site, receptor R4 is placed at the nearest building façade.
- R5: Location R5 represents the Bone Aire Motel at 42445 Sierra Highway, approximately 1,301 feet southeast of the project site. Receptor R5 is placed at the building façade.
- R6: Location R6 represents the potential worker receptor at 245 Avenue L-4, approximately 24 feet east of the project site. Receptor R6 is placed at the building facade.

Impact Analysis for Diesel Particulate Emissions

Diesel-fueled trucks would travel to/from the project site during operation of the project. Diesel trucks produce diesel particulate matter (DPM), which is known to be associated with health hazards, including cancer. To evaluate the project's potential to expose sensitive receptors and adjacent workers to Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs), including DPM, a Mobile Source Health Risk Assessment (HRA) was prepared for the proposed project, included as *Technical Appendix A2*. (Urban Crossroads, 2023b) The modeling domain is limited to the project's primary truck route and includes off-site sources in the study area for more than 0.75-mile. This modeling domain is more inclusive and conservative than using only a 0.25-mile modeling domain which is the distance supported by several reputable studies which conclude that the greatest potential health risks occur within a 0.25-mile of the primary source of emissions (in the case of the project, the primary source of emissions is the on-site idling and on-site travel). (Urban Crossroads, 2023b, p. 14)

On-site truck idling was calculated to occur as trucks enter and travel through the project site. Although the project's diesel-fueled truck and equipment operators are required by State law to comply with CARB's idling limit of 5 minutes, the project's HRA, conservatively analyzed truck idling at 15 minutes. (Urban Crossroads, 2023b, p. 18)

Construction-related Impacts

The sensitive receptor land use with the greatest potential exposure to project construction DPM source emissions is Location R3 which is located approximately 1,309 feet south of the Project site at an existing legal non-conforming residence located at 225 Avenue L-9. Because there are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the project site, R3 is placed at the façade of the residence. At the maximally exposed individual receptor (MEIR), the maximum incremental cancer risk attributable to project construction DPM source emissions is estimated at 0.06 in one million, which is less than the AVAQMD's significance threshold of 10 in one million. At this same location, non-cancer risks were estimated to be less than 0.01, which would not exceed the applicable threshold of 1.0. As such, the project would not cause a significant human health or cancer risk to adjacent land uses as a result of construction activities. All other sensitive receptors during construction activity would experience less risk than what is identified for this location. (Urban Crossroads, 2023b, pp. 21-22)

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 multicelluar 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, regulatory requirements require the

project operator to implement dust control measures in compliance with AVAQMD Rule 403, and implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR MM-1, 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.

AIR MM-1: Prior to ground disturbance activities, the project operator shall provide evidence to the Community Development 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 Community Development 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 Community Development 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 Community Development Director. No less than 30 days prior to any work commencing, this handout shall be mailed to all existing residences within a specified radius of the project boundaries as determined by the Community Development Director. The radius shall not exceed three miles and is dependent upon the location of the project site.

- 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.

APPLICABLE REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS (RR) AND DESIGN FEATURES (DF)

The Project Applicant has agreed to implement the following design features and comply with regulatory requirements in order to further reduce the level of emissions of criteria pollutants from the Project. The City of Lancaster is required to assure that implementing development complies with the assumptions relied upon herein and applicable regulatory requirements pertaining to the topic of Air Quality, which include the following regulatory requirements and design features. The Project shall be conditioned to implement the following design features and comply with the following regulatory requirements enforced through the City's Conditions of Approval for the Project.

AIR RR-1: 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.

Operational Impacts

Project-related DPM health risks were evaluated under the residential, worker, and school child receptor scenarios, which are summarized below. Detailed air dispersion model outputs and risk calculations are presented in Appendices 2.3 and 2.4, respectively, of the project's HRA (see Technical Appendix A2).

Residential Exposure Scenario

The residential land use with the greatest potential exposure to project DPM source emissions is Location R4, which represents the Montecito Apartment Complex located at 835 Avenue L, roughly 2,848 feet northwest of the project site. It should be noted that although Location R4 is not the nearest receptor to the project site, due to the location of emission sources and local meteorological conditions (i.e., wind speed and direction), it would experience the highest concentrations of DPM and thus the highest risk. At the maximally exposed individual receptor (MEIR), the maximum incremental cancer risk attributable to project DPM source emissions is estimated at 0.18 in one million, which is less than the AVAQMD's significance threshold of 10 in one million. At this same location, non-cancer risks were estimated to be <0.01, which would not exceed the applicable significance threshold of 1.0. Because all other modeled residential receptors are exposed to lesser concentrations than the MEIR analyzed herein, and TACs generally dissipate with distance from the source, all other residential receptors in the vicinity of the project site would be exposed to less emissions and therefore less risk than the MEIR identified in the project's HRA and herein. Therefore, the project would not cause a significant human health or cancer risk to nearby residences. (Urban Crossroads, 2023b, p. 22) Impacts would be less than significant.

Worker Exposure Scenario

The worker receptor land use with the greatest potential exposure to project DPM source emissions is Location R6, which represents the closest potential worker receptor approximately 24 feet east of the project site. At the maximally exposed individual worker receptor (MEIW), the maximum incremental cancer risk impact is 0.06 in one million which is less than the AVAQMD's threshold of 10 in one million. Maximum non-

cancer risks at this same location were estimated to be less than 0.01, which would not exceed the applicable significance threshold of 1.0. Because all other modeled worker receptors are located at a greater distance than MEIW, and DPM dissipates with distance from the source, all other worker receptors in the vicinity of the project site would be exposed to less emissions and therefore less risk than the MEIW identified herein. Therefore, the project would not cause a significant human health or cancer risk to workers located adjacent to the site. (Urban Crossroads, 2023b, pp. 22-23) Impacts would be less than significant.

School Child Exposure Scenario

A one-quarter mile radius, or 1,320 feet, is commonly utilized for identifying sensitive receptors, such as schools, which may be impacted by a proposed project. There are no schools within one-quarter mile of the project site. The nearest school is Assurance Learning Academy, which is located approximately 3,100 feet northeast of the project site. Because there is no reasonable potential that TAC emissions would cause significant health impacts at distances of more than one-quarter mile from the air pollution source, there would be no significant impacts that would occur to any schools in the vicinity of the project site. (Urban Crossroads, 2023b, p. 23) As such, the project would not cause a significant human health or cancer risk to nearby school children. No impact would occur.

APPLICABLE REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS (RR) AND DESIGN FEATURES (DF)

Although the impacts from the Project to air quality would be less than significant, the Project Applicant has agreed to implement the following design features and comply with regulatory requirements in order to further reduce the level of emissions of criteria pollutants from the Project. The City of Lancaster is required to assure that implementing development complies with the assumptions relied upon herein and applicable regulatory requirements pertaining to the topic of Air Quality, which include the following regulatory requirements and design features. The Project shall be conditioned to implement the following design features and comply with the following regulatory requirements enforced through the City's Conditions of Approval for the Project.

AIR RR-2: The Project shall comply with the provisions of AVAQMD Rule 401, Visible Emissions, which requires that a person shall not discharge into the atmosphere from any single source of emission whatsoever, any air contaminant for a period or periods aggregating more than three minutes in any one hour which is:

a. As dark or darker in shade as that designated No. 1 on the Ringelmann Chart, as published by the United States Bureau of Mines; or
b. Of such opacity as to obscure an observer's view to a degree equal to or greater than does smoke described in subparagraph (b)(1)(A) of Rule 401.

AIR RR-3: The Project shall comply with the provisions of AVAQMD Rule 402, Nuisance, which requires that a person shall not discharge air contaminants or other materials that would cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property.

AIR RR-4: The Project shall comply with the provisions of AVAQMD Rule 403, Fugitive Dust, by implementing the following dust control measures during construction activities, such as earth-moving activities, grading, and equipment travel on unpaved roads. Prior to grading permit issuance, the following notes shall be included on the grading plans. Project contractors shall be required to

ensure compliance with the notes. The notes also shall be specified in bid documents issued to prospective construction contractors.

a. All clearing, grading, earth-moving, or excavation activities shall cease when winds exceed 25 miles per hour (mph) per AVAQMD guidelines in order to limit fugitive dust emissions, or water shall be applied to the soil not more than 15 minutes prior to moving such soil to limit Visible Dust Emissions (VDE) to 20 percent opacity.
b. The contractor shall ensure that all disturbed unpaved roads and disturbed areas within the Project are watered or subject to the application of dust suppressants sufficient to limit VDE to 20 percent opacity.
c. The contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on unpaved roads and Project site areas are reduced to 15 mph or less.

AIR RR-5: The Project shall comply with AVAQMD rules related to sulfur content in fuels, including Rule 431.1, Sulfur Content of Gaseous Fuels; Rule 431.2, Sulfur Content of Liquid Fuels; and Rule 431.3, Sulfur Content of Fossil Fuels.

AIR RR-6: The Project shall comply with the provisions of AVAQMD Rule 1113, Architectural Coatings, by requiring that all architectural coatings must comply with the VOC limits established in Table 1 of Rule 1113.

AIR DF-1: Prior to the issuance of grading and building permits, the City shall review the construction documents for the Project to ensure that the construction contractors are obligated to implement the following measures to reduce construction air pollutant emissions to the extent feasible. These items shall also be listed in construction bid documents and construction contracts. The construction contractors shall allow City access to the construction site to inspect for adherence to these measures.

a. Ensure that the cleanest possible construction practices and equipment are used. This includes eliminating the idling of diesel-powered equipment and providing the necessary infrastructure (e.g., electrical hookups) to support zero and near-zero emission equipment and tools.
b. Implement, and plan accordingly for, the necessary infrastructure to support the zero and near-zero emission technology, vehicles, and equipment that will be operating onsite during construction. Necessary infrastructure may include the physical (e.g. needed footprint), energy, and fueling infrastructure for construction equipment, onsite vehicles and equipment, and medium-heavy and heavy-heavy duty trucks.
c. All off-road diesel-powered equipment used during construction shall be equipped with Tier 4 Interim or cleaner engines. If the operator lacks Tier 4 Interim or cleaner equipment, and it is not available for lease or short-term rental within 50 miles of the project site, Tier 3 or cleaner off-road construction equipment may be utilized subject to City approval.
d. Heavy-duty trucks entering the construction site during grading and building construction phases shall be model year 2014 or later. All heavy-duty trucks shall also meet CARB's lowest optional low oxides of nitrogen (NOx) standard starting in the year 2022.
e. All construction equipment and fleets shall be in compliance with all current air quality regulations.

AIR DF-2: Prior to issuance of building permits, the following features shall be demonstrated on the Project's building and landscape plans to the extent feasible.

a. Install low-water use appliances and fixtures.
b. Restrict the use of water for cleaning outdoor surfaces and prohibit systems that apply water to non-vegetated surfaces.
c. Implement water-sensitive urban design practices.
d. Install rainwater collection systems where feasible.

AIR DF-3: Prior to issuance of building permits, the following features shall be demonstrated on the Project's building and landscape plans to the extent feasible. Installation shall be verified by the City prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

a. Install rooftop solar panels to the extent feasible, with a capacity that matches the maximum allowed for distributed solar connections to the grid.
b. Install Energy Star-rated heating, cooling, lighting, and appliances.
c. Structures shall be equipped with outdoor electric outlets in the front and rear to facilitate use of electrical lawn and garden equipment.

AIR DF-4: Prior to issuance of building permits, the following features shall be demonstrated on the Project's building plans to the extent feasible over minimum California Code of Regulations Title 24 requirements. Installation shall be verified by the City prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

a. For use by employees and visitors conducting business at the building, install automobile electric vehicle (EV) charging stations at the minimum number required by the California Code of Regulations Title 24, or to serve at least 25% of the employee parking spaces, whichever is greater. All charging stations shall be equipped with Level 2 or faster chargers. Signs shall be posted indicating that the charging stations are for exclusive use by the building's employees and by visitors conducting business at the building.
b. Install appropriate electrical infrastructure sufficiently sized to accommodate the potential installation of additional auto and truck EV charging stations in the future.
c. Install raceways for conduit to tractor trailer parking areas in logical, gated locations determined by the Project Applicant during construction document plan check, for the purpose of accommodating the future installation of EV truck charging stations at such time this technology becomes commercially available. The charging station location(s) are to be located inside the gated and secured truck courts.

AIR DF-5: Cold storage warehouse operations (chilled, refrigerated, or freezer warehouse space) shall be prohibited. The City shall not approve any cold storage warehouse spaces as part of implementing building plans.

AIR DF-6: Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, legible, durable, weather-proof signs shall be installed at truck access gates, loading docks, and truck parking areas that identify applicable California Air Resources Board (CARB) anti-idling regulations. At a minimum, each sign shall include the following:

a. Instructions for truck drivers to shut off engines when not in use.

b. Instructions for drivers of diesel trucks to restrict idling to no more than 5 minutes once the vehicle is stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park" and the parking brake is engaged.
c. Telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and CARB to report violations.

AIR DF-7: Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the following language shall be included within tenant lease agreements in order to reduce operational air pollutant emissions to the extent feasible:

a. Information about energy efficiency, energy-efficient lighting and lighting control systems, energy management, and existing energy incentive programs.
b. Information about funding opportunities, such as the Carl Moyer Program, which provide incentives for using cleaner-than-required engines and equipment.
c. Requirements to use the cleanest technologies available and to provide the necessary infrastructure to support zero-emission vehicles, equipment, and appliances that would be operating on site. This requirement shall apply to equipment such as forklifts, handheld landscaping equipment, yard trucks, office appliances, etc.
d. Requirements to exclusively use zero-emission light and medium-duty delivery trucks and vans, when economically feasible.
e. Requirements to operate in compliance with, and to monitor compliance with, all current and applicable air quality regulations for on-road trucks including the California Air Resources Board's Heavy-Duty (Tractor-Trailer) Greenhouse Gas Regulation, Periodic Smoke Inspection Program, and the Statewide Truck and Bus Regulation.
f. Requirements and identification of the responsible party to maintain, replace, and upgrade rooftop solar panels per the manufacturer's recommendations for the life of the lease. Should the capacity for solar connections increase, additional solar panels shall be required to be added to the building .
g. Requirements and identification of the responsible party to maintain, replace, and repair the legible, durable, weather-proof signs that were installed at initial building occupancy placed at truck access gates, loading docks, and truck parking areas that identify applicable CARB anti-idling regulations.
h. Requirements that only haul trucks meeting model year 2010 engine emission standards shall be used for the on-road transport of materials to and from the Project site. The tenant shall be required to maintain records of haul truck trips to and from the site and make such records available for review by the City of Lancaster upon request.
i. Requirements for the building owner to provide a Green Cleaning Products and Paint Education Program available to the building tenant, to keep at the building's office, break room, leasing space, or on an accessible website.

d. <u>Less than Significant Impact.</u>

The project could produce odors during proposed construction activities resulting from construction equipment exhaust, application of asphalt, and/or the application of architectural coatings; however, standard construction practices would minimize the odor emissions and their associated impacts. Furthermore, any odors emitted during construction would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature, and would cease upon the completion of the respective phase of construction. In addition, construction activities on the project site would be required to comply with AVAQMD Rule 402, which prohibits the discharge of odorous emissions that would create a public

nuisance (Urban Crossroads, 2023a, p. 49). Accordingly, the proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people during construction. Therefore, short-term construction-related impacts would be less than significant.

During long-term operation, the project would include light industrial and general warehouse uses, which are not typically associated with objectionable odors. The temporary storage of refuse associated with the proposed project's long-term operational use could be a potential source of odor; however, project-generated refuse is required to be stored in covered containers and removed at regular intervals in compliance with the City's solid waste regulations, thereby precluding any significant odor impact. Furthermore, the proposed project would be required to comply with AVAQMD Rule 402, which prohibits the discharge of odorous emissions that would create a public nuisance, during long-term operation (Urban Crossroads, 2023a, p. 49). As such, long-term operation of the proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.

IV. Biological Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	***Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated***	***Less-than-Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a. **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.**

Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc., (GLA) prepared a Biological Technical Report (BTR) for the proposed project, included as *Technical Appendix B1* to this MND (GLA, 2023). The BTR summarized the biological studies and surveys conducted on the site which consisted of a) General Biological Surveys/Habitat Assessment; b) Vegetation mapping; c) Evaluation of Federal and State Jurisdictional Waters, d) Focused surveys/habitat assessments for special-status plants; e) Focused surveys for burrowing owl; f) Focused survey for desert tortoise; and g) Habitat assessment for Mohave ground squirrel. In addition, in 2023, Psomas followed up with a Focused Special Status Plant Survey and a Focused Survey for Burrowing Owl; included as *Technical Appendices B2 and B3*, respectively.

Native Vegetation

The project site contains approximately 9.31 acres of *Ericameria nauseosa* shrubland alliance – disturbed, which would be permanently impacted by the Project. This vegetation community is native but not sensitive and as such the project would not impact any native sensitive vegetation communities. (GLA, 2023, p. 33)

Special Status Vegetation Communities

Because the project site does not contain any special-status vegetation types, including those identified by the California Natural Diversity Base (CNDBB); development of the project would not impact any sensitive vegetation communities (GLA, 2023, p. 19).

Special-Status Plants

Two individual Joshua trees were observed on the project site during the surveys. California State Legislature passed the Western Joshua Tree Conservation Act (Assembly Bill AB1008) on June 27, 2023, which was signed by Governor Gavin Newsom on July 10, 2023, and retroactively took effect July 1, 2023. This bill, among other things, authorizes the department to authorize, by permit, the taking of a western Joshua tree if specified conditions are met, including, but not limited to, that the permittee mitigates all impacts to, and taking of, the western Joshua tree. The bill would authorize, in lieu of the applicant completing the mitigation measures on their own, a permittee to elect to satisfy the mitigation obligation by paying a fee to the State pursuant to a specified fee schedule. The bill requires the department to present the final conservation plan at a public meeting of the commission, for its review and approval, by December 31, 2024, and requires the commission to take final action on the plan by June 30, 2025. Because of the location of the two Joshua trees on the site, the Joshua trees cannot be protected in place and construction of the project would impact the Joshua Trees; therefore, impacts would be significant. With compliance to the mitigation provided below, impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Two other special-status plant species, crowned muilla (*Muilla coronata*) and white pygmy poppy (*Canbya candida*) (both a CNPS Rank 4) were determined to have a low potential to occur on the project site and were not

observed as occurring on the site by either GLA or Psomas biologists. According to GLA, because both species are qualified as CNPS Rank 4 species, even if crowned muilla and white-pygmy poppy are in the future found to be present on the Project site and impacted by construction of the Project, GLA does not expect that impacts would reach a level of significance under CEQA given the small size of the site in relation to the range of the species. (GLA, 2023, p. 34) (Psomas, 2023b, Table 1). As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Special-Status Animals

The CDFW guidelines specify time periods in which the four focused crepuscular surveys should be conducted during the breeding season: at least one survey between February 15 and April 15; three surveys between April 15 and July 15; with at least one survey after June 15. Surveys should be conducted at least three weeks apart. GLA biologists conducted the initial focused crepuscular survey on March 7, 2023. Psomas biologists conducted subsequent focused crepuscular surveys on May 25; June 16 and July 7, 2023. (Psomas, 2023a, p. 3)

No burrowing owl individuals or active burrowing owl burrows were observed during the surveys. In addition, no evidence (e.g., cast pellets, feathers, whitewash clustered at a burrow, or prey remains) of burrowing owl was detected during the surveys. Although the survey area supports a high density of California ground squirrel burrows; the majority of which are currently occupied by ground squirrels, burrowing owls are unable to utilize ground squirrel burrow complexes while they remain occupied. According to both GLA biologists and GLA biologists, burrowing owls are not expected to occur in the survey area at this time. (Psomas, 2023a, p. 3)

Although not likely to migrate onto the site in the future based on the level of site disturbance, because the species is migratory, if breeding owls are detected on the site and they are disturbed, impacts to breeding owls and their corresponding territories would be considered significant. In addition, take of burrowing owls is prohibited under the MBTA and the Fish and Game Code. Mitigation is provided below to reduce impacts to less than significant and to avoid direct take of burrowing owls should the species migrate onto the site prior to Project construction. Pre-construction burrowing owl surveys would be conducted within 30 days of site disturbance and measures would be taken in the event of the species being present. With mandatory compliance with the mitigation provided herein, impacts to burrowing owl would be less than significant. (GLA, 2023, p. 28, 34 and Table 4-4)

Southern Grasshopper Mouse: The Project site contains habitat that is marginally suitable for the southern grasshopper mouse; however, GLA determined that due to the low quality of habitat (lack of suitable burrows and high levels of human disturbance) present for the species and the minimal extent of impacts to habitat compared to the range of the species, the loss of approximately 9.31 acres of marginally suitable habitat would not reach a level of significance. (GLA, 2023, p. 28-29, 34 and Table 4-4)

State of Federally Listed Wildlife Species

Desert Tortoise: The desert tortoise is listed as federally and State threatened by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and CDFW. Desert tortoise, or evidence of desert tortoise (e.g., live tortoises, shell, bones, scutes (plates of keratin), limbs, scats, burrows, pallets, tracks, eggshell fragments, courtship rings, drinking sites, mineral licks, etc.) were not detected on the project site during surveys; therefore, it has been determined that the site is not occupied by desert tortoise. Thus, no impact would occur to desert tortoise. (GLA, 2023, p. 29 and Table 4-4)

Mohave Ground Squirrel: The Mohave Ground Squirrel (MGS) is designated as State threatened by the CDFW. A focused habitat assessment for MGS was conducted at the project site on May 9, 10, and 11, 2022. Based on

several factors including past and ongoing disturbance, including substantial disturbance to the topsoil and the general absence of this species in the immediate vicinity of the project site as evidenced through the review of records of extant populations of this species within greater than five miles from the Project site, it was determined that it is unlikely that MGS would be expected to occur at the project site. Thus, no impact would occur. (GLA, 2023, p. 29 and Table 4-4)

Special-Status Raptors

The project site provides marginally suitable foraging habitat for raptors. During the general biological surveys and focused burrowing owl surveys, raptor species were not detected within the project site; however, small mammal burrows were detected and the project site supports some habitat for lizards, snakes, and invertebrates. The project would result in no direct take of raptors and the loss of foraging habitat is considered less than significant given the size and quality of the project site in compared to the large range of foraging habitat available in the range of the species. (GLA, 2023, p. 29, 30 and Table 4-4)

Nesting Birds

The project site contains shrubs and ground cover that provide suitable habitat for nesting migratory birds. Impacts to nesting birds are prohibited under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code. Bird diversity within the project site is low due to the disturbed nature of the project site and proximity to major streets, and residential and commercial buildings. (GLA, 2023, p. 30) However, the loss of an active migratory bird nest, including nests of common species, would be considered a violation of the MBTA and Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code. The MBTA and California Fish and Game Code prohibits the taking of migratory birds, nests, and eggs; therefore, the potential loss of an active nest would be considered potentially significant. Accordingly, the project has the potential to impact nesting migratory birds if active nests are disturbed during the nesting season (generally February 1 and September 15) (GLA, 2023, p. 34). With compliance with the mitigation provided herein, impacts would be less than significant.

MITIGATION:

BIO MM-1: Prior to conducting any ground disturbance, vegetation removal or any construction-related activities that could result in direct or indirect impacts to the Joshua tree, the Applicant will obtain authorization from CDFW through either the Incidental Take Permit (ITP) or Joshua Tree Conservation Act permitting process and implementation of all conditions set forth within which may include one or more of the following through coordination with CDFW: a) translocation of the two Joshua trees to land that supports suitable habitat for the species, which will be placed under a conservation easement, restrictive covenant, or similar protective mechanism, with replacement of the tree through planting of nursery-grown tree(s) if the two trees do not survive translocation at a minimum 1:1 ratio; b) preservation in perpetuity of the existing trees at the Project site; and/or c) payment of mitigation fee into the Joshua Tree Mitigation Fund as per the Joshua Tree Conservation Act if CDFW has established the fund prior to the time of Project impacts.

BIO-MM-2: A pre-construction survey for the burrowing owl shall be conducted by a qualified Biologist within 14 to 30 days prior to conducting any ground disturbing activities to ensure that no mortality of the species occurs (CDFW 2012). If time lapses of greater than 30 days occur during construction

in a particular portion of the work area, an additional survey shall be conducted by a qualified Biologist within 24 hours prior to vegetation clearing and/or ground disturbance in that area.

- If burrowing owls are not detected, no further action is required, and grading can commence.

- If burrowing owls are detected, the following shall apply:

    - Coordination with CDFW shall occur and the burrowing owl shall be passively excluded from the burrow following accepted CDFW protocols to avoid direct take of burrowing owl. If owls are detected in a breeding role, coordination with CDFW and the exclusion process described above will be subject to CDFW approval and shall take place once the Biologist has determined that nesting has concluded and that the young have dispersed from the site.
    - Compensation for the loss of occupied burrowing owl breeding habitat shall occur at a 1:1 ratio such that the habitat acreage, number of burrows and burrowing owls impacted are replaced. As required by CDFW (2012), the Burrowing Owl Relocation Plan shall be approved by CDFW and will ensure that lands used to compensate for the loss of habitat, burrows, and burrowing owls will be placed into a Conservation Easement or similar protective mechanism and managed in perpetuity.

BIO MM-3: The project applicant shall conduct preconstruction nesting birds and raptors surveys prior to the issuance of any construction related permits.

- The project applicant or its designee shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey for nesting birds and raptors. The pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 30 days prior to vegetation clearing. The pre-construction nesting bird survey area shall include the project impact area (i.e., disturbance footprint) plus a 250-foot buffer to search for nesting birds and a 500-foot buffer to search for nesting raptors. If no active nests are found, no further mitigation would be required.

- If an active nest is located in the pre-construction nesting bird survey area, the qualified biologist shall delineate an appropriate buffer to protect the nest based on the sensitivity of the species. A protective buffer of 500 feet shall be used to protect nesting raptors. If appropriate, a smaller buffer may be considered based on site topography, existing disturbance, sensitivity of the individuals (established by observing the individuals at the nest), and the type of construction activity. No construction activities shall be allowed in the designated buffer until the qualified biologist determines that nesting activity has ended. Construction may proceed within the buffer once the qualified biologist determines that nesting activity has ceased (i.e., fledglings have left the nest or the nest has failed). The designated buffer shall be clearly marked in the field. and shall be mapped as Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) on the Project's construction plans.

- Prior to the initiation of construction activities, an email summary of the results shall be submitted to the City with a map of any active nests found and their designated buffers. Construction shall be allowed to proceed if standard buffer distances are employed for any

active nests. The qualified biologist shall then prepare a formal Letter Report describing methods used, results of the survey, recommended buffers, and/or justification for buffer reductions. The Letter Report shall be submitted to the City within one week of completion of the survey. If an active nest is observed during the survey, the Letter Report shall include a map showing the designated protective buffer.

b. **No Impact.**

The project site does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. In addition, the proposed project would not impact lands proposed or designated as Critical Habitat by the USFWS (GLA, 2023, p. 34). No impact would occur.

c. **No Impact.**

Because no State or federally protected wetlands occur on the project site, implementation of the project would have no potential to 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; thus, no impact would occur.

d. **Less than Significant impact.**

The Project site is surrounded on two sides by existing development and existing conditions at the Project site are characterized by a high level of disturbance, including consistent human presence. As determined by the Project's biologists, the Project site does not include water that supports any known migratory fish or established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or a known native wildlife nursery site. (GLA, 2023, p. 30) However, as discussed in the analysis for Threshold (a), the loss of an active migratory bird nest, including nests of common species, would be considered a violation of the MBTA and Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code. The MBTA and California Fish and Game Code prohibits the taking of migratory birds, nests, and eggs; therefore, the potential loss of an active nest of a migratory bird species would be considered potentially significant. Accordingly, the Project has the potential to impact nesting migratory birds if active nests were disturbed during the nesting season (February 1 and September 15) which is considered a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure BIO MM-2 as listed under Threshold (a) would ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

e. No Impact

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 $770.00/acre to 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. **No Impact**.

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 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.

V. Cultural Resources

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

a-c. Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

A site-specific cultural resources assessment (CRA) was prepared for the project by PaleoWest, LLC (PaleoWest), and is included as *Technical Appendix C1.* (PaleoWest, 2023) As part of the CRA, a literature review and record search was conducted on August 23, 2022 at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC). This inventory effort included the project site and a 0.5-mile radius around the project site, collectively termed the study area. The objective of the records search was to identify prehistoric or historic period cultural resources that have been previously recorded within the study area during prior cultural resource investigations. As part of the cultural resources inventory, historical maps and aerial images were also examined to characterize the developmental history of the project area and surrounding area. The records search indicated that 21 previous cultural resource studies have been conducted within 0.5-mile of the project site, resulting in the identification of five historic period cultural resource sites. These sites consisted of a refuse scatter; a single-family residence; structural debris and landscaping; a concrete foundation, concrete slabs, and a dilapidated fence line; and a trash scatter and trash dump. None of these previously recorded cultural resources were documented within the project site. In addition to completing the records search, a pedestrian survey of the project site was conducted on August 29, 2022. Significant amounts of modern trash were noted throughout the project site. No prehistoric archaeological resources were identified on the project site during the survey. Six newly identified isolated historic period occurrences, consisting of cans, were identified along the western edge of the project site. It was determined that the cans are likely displaced remnants of one of the five previously identified cultural resource sites located to the west, outside of the project site, and thus are not recommended eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). (PaleoWest, 2023, pp. 15-21)

Based on the records search, background and archival research, and the pedestrian field survey of the Project site, no prehistoric period archaeological resources were identified at the Project site. Six isolated historic period artifacts are within the Project area, however these isolated occurrences appear to be displaced remnants of a previously identified cultural resource site located to the west, outside of the Project site. Based on the amount of modern disturbance that has occurred on the Project site, the site has a low sensitivity for buried historic period resources. (PaleoWest, 2023, p. 23) However, although unlikely, there is a remote potential that archaeological resources could be uncovered during grading activities associated with the Project. As such, there is a potential

for the Project to have a significant impact if significant archaeological resources meeting the definition given in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, are unearthed and not properly treated, for which mitigation would be required.

While no specific tribal or cultural resources were identified during the AB 52 process, and the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians did not identify any tribal cultural resources on the project site, they did request specific mitigation measures regarding worker education and procedures to follow in the event resources are identified.

The project site does not contain a cemetery and no known formal cemeteries are located within the immediate vicinity of the project site. Field surveys conducted on the project site did not identify the presence of any human remains and no human remains are known to exist beneath the surface of the site (PaleoWest, 2022a). Nevertheless, the remote potential exists that human remains may be unearthed during grading and excavation activities associated with project construction.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL MM-1 would ensure the proper identification and subsequent treatment of any significant archaeological resources that may be encountered during ground-disturbing activities associated with Project construction. With implementation of the required mitigation, the Project's potential impacts to important archaeological resources would be reduced to less than significant.

MITIGATION

CUL-MM-1: Prior to the start of construction a qualified representative of the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians (FTBMI) shall conduct a Tribal Cultural Resources Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training for construction personnel; regarding aspects of Tribal Cultural Resources and the procedures for notifying the FTBMI should Tribal Cultural Resources be discovered by construction staff.

If cultural resources are discovered during the Project's ground-disturbing activities, all work in the immediate vicinity (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 site outside of the buffered area may continue during this assessment period.

The FTBMI shall be contacted about any pre-contact and/or post-contact finds and be provided information after the archaeologist makes their initial assessment of the nature of the find, to provide Tribal input with regards to significant and treatment.

a. Should the find be deemed significant, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), the project applicant shall retain a professional Native American monitor procured by the FTBMI to observe all remaining ground-disturbing activities including, but not limited to , excavating, digging, trenching, plowing, drilling, tunneling, quarrying, grading, leveling, clearing, driving posts, auguring, blasting, stripping topsoil or similar activity, and archaeological work.

VI. Energy

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a. **Less than Significant Impact**.

Urban Crossroads, Inc., prepared an Energy Analysis (EA) for the proposed project, included as *Technical Appendix D.* (Urban Crossroads, 2023c) Implementation of the project would result in the conversion of the project site from its existing vacant, undeveloped condition to a building for light industrial and warehouse use. This change in the project site's land use would increase the project site's demand for energy.

Construction Energy Demands

Fuel consumed by construction equipment would be the primary energy resource expended over the course of project construction. The energy required to accomplish construction of the project was calculated and the total estimated electricity usage would be approximately 111,265 kilowatt hours (kWh). The total estimated diesel fuel consumption for on-site equipment would be approximately 52,302 gallons. Diesel fuel would be supplied by local vendors. Additionally, construction worker trips (traveling to and from the project site) for full construction of the proposed project would result in the estimated fuel consumption of 20,038 gallons of fuel. Finally, fuel consumption from construction vendor trips (medium and heavy-duty trucks) is estimated to total approximately 13,767 gallons. (Urban Crossroads, 2023c, pp. 24-29)

Equipment used for project construction would be required by law to conform to CARB regulations and California emissions standards. CCR Title 13, Motor Vehicles, § 2449(d)(3) Idling, limits idling times of construction vehicles to no more than five minutes, thereby precluding unnecessary and wasteful consumption of fuel due to unproductive idling of construction equipment. Additionally, § 2449(d)(3) requires that project grading plans reference the requirement that a sign shall be posted on-site stating that construction workers shall shut off engines at or before five minutes of idling. Enforcement of idling limitations occurs through periodic site inspections conducted by City building officials, and/or in response to citizen complaints. (Urban Crossroads, 2023c, p. 30)

There are no unusual project characteristics or construction processes that would require the use of equipment that would be more energy intensive than is used for comparable activities; or equipment that would not conform to current emissions standards (and related fuel efficiencies). Equipment employed in construction of the project would therefore not result in the inefficient wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of fuel. (Urban Crossroads, 2023c, p. 30) Thus, project construction energy consumption would not be considered inefficient, wasteful, or otherwise unnecessary and impacts would be less than significant.

Operational Energy Demands

Energy consumption related to project operations would include transportation energy demands (energy consumed by employee and patron vehicles accessing the project site), energy demands from operational equipment, and facilities energy demands (energy consumed by building operations and site maintenance activities) as discussed below. (Urban Crossroads, 2023c, p. 30)

Transportation Energy Demands

Energy that would be consumed by project-generated traffic is a function of total vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and estimated vehicle fuel economies of vehicles accessing the project site. Traffic generated by the operation of the project would result in an estimated annual fuel demand of 162,556 gallons of fuel (Urban Crossroads, 2023c, p. 31)

Fuel would be provided by commercial fuel vendors. Trip generation and VMT generated by the project would be typical of light industrial and general warehouse uses of similar scale and configuration, as reflected respectively in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (11th Ed., 2021), and CalEEMod. The project does not propose uses or operations that would inherently result in excessive and wasteful vehicle trips and VMT, nor is the project associated with excess and wasteful vehicle energy consumption. (Urban Crossroads, 2023c, p. 33)

Enhanced fuel economies realized pursuant to federal and state regulatory actions and related transition of vehicles to alternative energy sources (e.g., electricity, natural gas, biofuels, hydrogen cells) over time (as is the current trend) would likely decrease future gasoline fuel demands per VMT. The location of the project site proximate to regional and local roadway systems would tend to reduce VMT within the region, and act to reduce regional vehicle energy demands. In compliance with the California Green Building Standards Code and City requirements, the project would promote the use of bicycles as an alternative means of transportation by providing on-site bicycle parking accommodations. Thus, project transportation energy consumption would not be considered inefficient, wasteful, or otherwise unnecessary. (Urban Crossroads, 2023c, pp. 34-35)

On-Site Cargo Handling Equipment

It is common for light industrial and general warehouse buildings to require the operation of exterior cargo handling equipment in the building's truck court areas. On-site cargo handling equipment used by the project would result in approximately 4,642 gallons of natural gas. On-site equipment use of fuel would not be atypical for the type of construction proposed because there are no aspects of the project's proposed operations that are unusual or energy-intensive, and project on-site equipment would conform to the applicable CARB emissions standards, acting to promote equipment fuel efficiencies. (Urban Crossroads, 2023c, p. 35)

Facility Energy Demands

Long-term operation of the project is calculated to consume an estimated 1,215,961 kWh/year of electricity. Electricity would be distributed to the project by Southern California Edison (SCE) from Lancaster Choice Energy. Based on information provided by the project applicant, the project would not use natural gas for the building envelope and as such, natural gas consumption has not been analyzed. (Urban Crossroads, 2023c, p. 35) The Project proposes conventional light industrial and general warehouse use reflecting contemporary energy efficient/energy conserving designs and operational programs consistent with the California Green Building Standards Code Title 24, which would ensure that the project's energy demands would not be considered inefficient, wasteful, or otherwise unnecessary. The project would therefore not cause or result in the need for

additional energy producing or transmission facilities considered inefficient, wasteful, or otherwise unnecessary. (Urban Crossroads, 2023c, p. 35)

Based on the foregoing analysis, implementation of the project would not result in the result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Less than Significant Impact**.

The project would comply with applicable federal, State, and regional requirements. A summary of the project's consistency is provided below.

Consistency with Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA)

Transportation and access to the project is provided by the local and regional roadway systems and the project would not interfere with intermodal transportation plans or projects that may be realized pursuant to the ISTEA because SCAG is not planning for intermodal facilities on or through the project site. (Urban Crossroads, 2023c, p. 37)

Consistency with Transportation Equity Act (TEA-21)

The project site is located along major transportation corridors with proximate access to the Interstate freeway system. The project site facilitates access to reduce VMT, takes advantage of existing infrastructure systems, and promotes land use compatibilities through collocation of similar uses. The project supports the strong planning processes emphasized under TEA-21 and is therefore consistent with and would not otherwise interfere with implementation of TEA-21. (Urban Crossroads, 2023c, p. 37)

Consistency with Integrated Energy Policy Report (IEPR)

Electricity for the project site would be distributed by SCE from Lancaster Choice Energy. SCE's Clean Power and Electrification Pathway white paper builds on state programs and policies. As such, the project is consistent with, and would not otherwise interfere with, nor obstruct implementation the goals presented in the 2022 IEPR. Additionally, the project would comply with the applicable Title 24 standards which would ensure that the project energy demands would not be inefficient, wasteful, or otherwise unnecessary. As such, development of the proposed project would support the goals presented in the 2022 IEPR. (Urban Crossroads, 2023c, p. 37)

Consistency with State of California Energy Plan

The project site is located along major transportation corridors with proximate access to the Interstate freeway system. The project site takes advantage of existing infrastructure systems. The project supports urban design and planning processes identified under the State of California Energy Plan, and therefore is consistent with, and would not otherwise interfere with, nor obstruct implementation of the State of California Energy Plan. (Urban Crossroads, 2023c, p. 38)

Consistency with California Code Title 24

The project would be required to comply with the applicable standards of the 2022 California Green Building Code Standards, which became effective on January 1, 2023, and which would ensure that the project energy demands would not be inefficient, wasteful, or otherwise unnecessary. (Urban Crossroads, 2023c, p. 38)

Consistency with SB 350

The proposed project would use energy distributed by SCE from Lancaster Choice Energy, which has committed to diversify their portfolio of energy sources by increasing energy from wind and solar sources. No feature of the project would interfere with implementation of SB 350. Additionally, the project would be designed and constructed to implement the energy efficiency measures for new industrial developments and would include several measures designed to reduce energy consumption. (Urban Crossroads, 2023c, p. 38)

Based on the preceding analysis, the project would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required. (Urban Crossroads, 2023c, p. 38)

VII. Geology and Soils

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

a. i) **No Impact.**

Southern California Geotechnical (SGC) conducted a review, field exploration, laboratory testing and geotechnical analysis of the project site and summarized the results in a geotechnical investigation report, included as *Technical Appendix E1.* (SCG, 2022a) SCG also prepared a Results of Infiltration Testing report for the proposed project, included as *Technical Appendix E2* (SCG, 2022b). The project site is not located within a mapped Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and no evidence of faulting was identified during the preparation of the geotechnical investigation. Therefore, the possibility of significant fault rupture at the project site is considered to be low. (SCG,

2022a, p. 9) Because the project site is not located on a known fault and substantial fault rupture at the project site is considered low, there is no potential for the project to directly or indirectly expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects related to ground rupture of a known earthquake fault. No impact would occur.

ii) **Less than Significant Impact.**

The project site is located in an area which is subject to strong ground motions due to earthquakes and numerous faults capable of producing significant ground motions are located near the project site (SCG, 2022a, p. 9). This risk is not substantially different than the risk that is experienced by other properties in southern California. The design of the proposed project would be in conformance with the latest California Building Standards Commission Code provisions for earthquake design and is expected to provide adequate attenuation of ground-shaking hazards that are typical to southern California (SCG, 2022a, p. 10).

State law requires that all cities and counties in California enforce the building codes as mandated by the California Building Standards Commission. As a mandatory condition of project approval, the project's buildings would be required to be constructed in accordance with currently adopted California Building Standards Code, City of Lancaster Ordinances, and California Title 24 regulations in effect at the time of building plan submittal. Furthermore, the project would be required to comply with the site-specific grading and construction recommendations contained within the project's Geotechnical Investigation (With the project's compliance with these standard and site specific design and construction measures, potential impacts related to seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

iii) **No Impact.**

The project site is not located in a designated liquefaction hazard zone. Additionally, SCG concluded that because of the lack of a historic high ground water table within the upper 50± feet of the ground surface, liquefaction is not considered to be a design concern for the project site. (SCG, 2022a, p. 11) Accordingly, no impact would occur.

v) No Impact.

According to Figure 4-3 of the City's General Plan Safety Element, the project site is not located in a landslide susceptible area (City of Lancaster, 2022a). The topography of the project site is generally flat and does not contain substantial natural or man-made slopes. In addition, the areas surrounding the project site are relatively flat, and have no hillsides that may have the potential for landslide or rockfall hazards. (Google Earth, 2022) Thus, no impacts would occur.

b. **Less than Significant Impact.**

Erosion has the potential to occur from project-related construction activities and during long-term operation of the project as discussed below.

Temporary Construction-Related Activities

Construction of the project would involve grading, paving, utility installation, building construction, and landscape installation which has the potential to temporarily expose on-site soils that would be subject to erosion during rainfall events or high winds. Pursuant to State Water Resources Control Board requirements, the project Applicant is required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for construction activities, including proposed grading. The NPDES permit is required for all projects that include construction activities, such as clearing, grading, and/or excavation that disturb at least one (1) acre of total land area. The City's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) NPDES Permit would require the project applicant to prepare

and submit to the City for approval, a project-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would identify a combination of erosion control and sediment control measures (i.e., Best Management Practices) to reduce or eliminate sediment discharge to surface water from stormwater and non-stormwater discharges during construction. In addition, the project would be required to comply with LMC Section 8.16.030 (Disturbing Surface of Land or Causing Wind Erosion Prohibited) and AVAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) (See Mitigation Measure AIR MM-1), which would reduce the amount of particulate matter in the air and minimize the potential for wind erosion. With mandatory compliance to the requirements identified in the project's SWPPP, as well as applicable regulatory requirements, the potential for water and/or wind erosion impacts during project construction would be less than significant.

Long-Term Operational Activities

Following construction, susceptibility to wind and water erosion on the project site would be less than existing conditions because the project site would be landscaped and covered with impervious surfaces. Surface water runoff from the project site would be captured by a series of catch basins and treated by an on-site storm drain system which will drain to and be treated by a retention basin located at the western portion of the project site. This system is designed to reduce peak flow from the project site. (Sikand, 2022, p. 4) Site outflow would be directed into the same existing condition outlet area through the basin spillway, thus following the flow conveyance from the existing project site conditions. (Sikand, 2022, p. 4)

The retention basin would remove waterborne pollutants from stormwater flows, including silt and sediment. The basin and its subsurface water quality design features also would facilitate percolation to maximize on-site infiltration and minimize the amount of stormwater which could, potentially, carry sediment discharged from the site. These design features would be effective at removing silt and sediment from stormwater runoff. Post-construction maintenance and operational measures would be necessary to ensure ongoing erosion protection. The proposed project would not therefore result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil during long-term operation. In other words, implementation of the project would result in less long-term erosion and loss of topsoil than under the site's existing conditions. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

c. **Less Than Significant Impact**.

The project site is not located within an area susceptible to landslides. The topography of the Project site is generally flat and does not contain substantial natural or man-made slopes that could cause landslides. According to the project's geotechnical report, the potential for geologic hazards such as lateral spreading and subsidence affecting the project site is considered low (SCG, 2022a, p. 9) Additionally, according to Figure 2-3 of the City's MEA, the project site is located in an area with low shrink/swell potential, with no known locations of sinkholes or fissures (City of Lancaster, 2009b). As previously discussed, the project site is not located in a designated liquefaction hazard zone. The project's geotechnical report indicates that the near-surface soils possess a minor to moderate potential for collapse and are not considered suitable to support the foundation loads of the new building. As such, remedial grading would be necessary to remove the upper portion of the near-surface soils and replace the materials as compacted structural fill soils which would then be stable to support the building (SCG, 2022a, p. 11) The proposed project would be required by the City to incorporate the recommendations contained within the Geotechnical Investigation into the grading plan for the project. Following these recommendations would ensure that impacts associated with soil instability would be less than significant.

d. **Less than Significant Impact.**

According to SCG's Geotechnical Investigation, the near-surface soils consist of sands and silty sands with negligible clay content. Laboratory testing performed on a representative sample of the near-surface soils

indicates that the soils possess a very low expansion potential, with an expansion index of 2 (SCG, 2022a, p. 12). As such, implementation of the project would result in less than significant impacts associated with expansive soils and would not create substantial risks to life or property.

e. **No Impact**.

The proposed project would be tied into the sanitary sewer system upon annexation. No septic or alternative means of waste water disposal are part of the proposed project.. Therefore, no impact would occur.

f. **Less than Significant Impact.**

A paleontological resources assessment was completed by PaleoWest and is included as *Technical Appendix C2*. (PaleoWest, 2022) Based on the literature review and museum records search completed by PaleoWest, the paleontological sensitivity of the project site was determined to have a low potential to contain intact paleontological resources because the Quaternary alluvium mapped at the surface of the project site are typically too young to contain fossilized remains. These sediments may be underlain at an unknown depth by older Pleistocene deposits which have proven to yield significant vertebrate fossils in the vicinity of the project area and elsewhere. Project excavation is expected to be relatively shallow, and any sensitive older geologic deposits present at depth on the project site are unlikely to be impacted by project development. Therefore, the potential for encountering fossil resources during project construction is low and impacts would be less than significant.. (PaleoWest, 2022, p. 8)

VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

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

a. <u>Less than Significant Impact</u>

Urban Crossroads prepared a Greenhouse Gas Analysis for the proposed project, included as *Technical Appendix F.* (Urban Crossroads, 2023d)

Global Climate Change (GCC) refers to the change in average meteorological conditions on the earth with respect to temperature, wind patterns, precipitation, and storms. Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are often referred to as greenhouse gasses (GHGs). An individual project cannot generate GHG emissions to affect a discernible change in global climate. However, the proposed project may participate in the potential for GCC by its incremental contribution of GHGs combined with the cumulative increase of all other sources of GHGs, which when taken together constitute potential influences on GCC. (Urban Crossroads, 2023d, p. 10)

Increases in Earth's ambient temperatures would result in more intense heat waves, causing more heat-related deaths. Scientists also purport those higher ambient temperatures would increase disease survival rates and result in more widespread disease. Climate change would likely cause shifts in weather patterns, potentially resulting in devastating droughts and food shortages in some areas. (Urban Crossroads, 2023d, p. 16)

The City of Lancaster Climate Action Plan (CAP) documents the City's GHG emissions inventories and the progress the City has made through its alternative energy and sustainability programs. The CAP also identifies projects that would enhance the City's ability to further reduce GHG emissions. A total of 61 projects across eight sectors were identified: traffic, energy, municipal operations, water, waste, built environment, community, and land use. Additionally, the CAP evaluates four different future scenarios and the proposed measures were quantified for each scenario based upon the project descriptions, action items, and indicators. These scenarios all assume that Lancaster Choice Energy (LCE) has a different amount of alternative energy in their portfolio by 2050. These scenarios all result in varying amounts of GHG reductions. Under all scenarios, the City meets the 2020 target by a wide margin and makes substantial progress towards achieving the post-2020 reduction targets. (Urban Crossroads, 2023d, pp. 40-41)

Based on the foregoing guidance, the greenhouse gas analysis relies on compliance with a local air district threshold in the determination of significance of Project-related GHG emissions. Specifically, the interim 3,000 MTCO2e/yr threshold recommended by South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for residential and commercial sector projects is used to compare Project-related GHG emissions. Although the Project is not

located within the SCAQMD's jurisdiction, the SCAQMD's recommended threshold of 3,000 MTCO2e/yr is more restrictive than the AVAQMD's adopted significance threshold for GHGs of 100,000 tpy (90,719 MTCO2e/yr). (Urban Crossroads, 2023d, p. 43)

Thus, for purposes of analysis in the project's GHG analysis and herein, if project-related GHG emissions do not exceed the 3,000 $MTCO_2e$/yr threshold, then Project-related GHG emissions would clearly have a less-than-significant impact pursuant to Threshold GHG-1. On the other hand, if Project-related GHG emissions exceed 3,000 MTCO2e/yr, the Project would be considered a substantial source of GHG emissions. (Urban Crossroads, 2023d, p. 44)

CalEEMod Version 2022.1 was used to calculate the Project's construction-source and operational-source criteria pollutants and GHG emissions from direct and indirect sources. Output from the model runs for construction and operational activity are provided in Appendices 3.1. and 3.2 of Technical Appendix F. CalEEMod includes GHG emissions from construction, area, energy, mobile, waste, and water sources. For construction phase project emissions, GHGs are quantified and amortized over the life of the project. Operational activities associated with the project would result in emissions of carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), and N_2O from the following primary sources: area source emissions; energy source emissions; mobile source emissions; on-site cargo handling equipment emissions; water supply, treatment, and distribution; solid waste and refrigerants. (Urban Crossroads, 2023d, pp. 44, 46-47) The estimated project-related GHG emissions are summarized in Table 5, *Project Greenhouse Gas Emissions Summary.* (Urban Crossroads, 2023d, p. 51)

Detailed operation model outputs for the project are presented in Appendix 3.2 of Technical Appendix F. Direct and indirect operational emissions associated with the project are compared with the screening threshold of 3,000 $MTCO_2e$/yr. Without accounting for applicable regulatory requirements and features, as shown in Table 5, the annual GHG emissions associated with the operation of the project are calculated to be 2,043.96 $MTCO_2e$ of GHG emissions, which is below the screening threshold of 3,000 $MTCO_2e$/yr. Accordingly, the proposed project would not generate GHGs, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. (Urban Crossroads, 2023d, p. 51)

Table 5 Project Greenhouse Gas Emissions Summary

Emission Source	Emissions (MT/yr)				
	CO_2	**CH_4**	**N_2O**	**Refrigerants**	**Total CO_2e**
Annual construction-related emissions amortized over 30 years	27.63	0.001	0.001	0.02	28.00
Mobile Source	1,497.00	0.02	0.19	2.14	1,557.00
Area Source	3.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.27
Energy Source	192.30	0.02	0.00	0.00	193.70
Water Usage	62.31	1.65	0.04	0.00	115.10
Waste	19.11	1.91	0.00	0.00	66.90
Refrigerants	0.00	0.00	0.00	32.61	32.61
On-Site Equipment					47.38
Total CO_2e (All Sources)	**2,043.96**				

Source: CalEEMod output, See Appendices 3.1 and 3.2 of the Project's Greenhouse Gas Analysis (Technical Appendix F) for detailed model outputs.
Note: Total CO_2e = Carbon Dioxide Equivalents, in this case, CH_4, N_2O, and refrigerants are multiplied in CalEEMod by their respective global warming

potential (GWP) before being added to represent a CO_2e.
(Urban Crossroads, 2023d, Table 3-6)

b. **Less than Significant Impact.**

Pursuant to Section 15604.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, a lead agency may rely on qualitative analysis or performance-based standards to determine the significance of impacts from GHG emissions. Project consistency with Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and Senate Bill (SB) 32 are discussed below. The project's consistency with the SB 32 (2022 Scoping Plan) also satisfies consistency with AB 32 since the 2022 Scoping Plan is based on the overall targets established by AB 32 (Urban Crossroads, 2023d, p. 51).

2022 CARB Scoping Plan Consistency

On December 15, 2022, CARB adopted the 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality. The 2022 Scoping Plan builds on the prior 2017 Scoping Plan as well as the requirements set forth by AB 1279, which directs the State to become carbon neutral no later than 2045. To achieve this statutory objective, the 2022 Scoping Plan lays out how California can reduce GHG emissions by 85% below 1990 levels and achieve carbon neutrality by 2045. Unlike the 2017 Scoping Plan, CARB no longer includes a numeric per capita threshold and instead advocates for compliance with a local GHG reduction strategy (CAP) consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. (CARB, 2022a)

The project would not impede the State's progress towards carbon neutrality by 2045 under the 2022 Scoping Plan. The project would be required to comply with applicable current and future regulatory requirements promulgated through the 2022 Scoping Plan. Some of the current transportation sector policies that the project would comply with (through vehicle manufacturer compliance) include: Advanced Clean Cars II, Advanced Clean Trucks, Advanced Clean Fleets, Zero Emission Forklifts, the Off-Road Zero-Emission Targeted Manufacturer rule, Clean Off-Road Fleet Recognition Program, In-use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets Regulation, Off-Road Zero-Emission Targeted Manufacturer rule, Clean Off-Road Fleet Recognition Program, Amendments to the In-use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets Regulation, carbon pricing through the Cap-and-Trade Program, and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard. Further, the project would implement design features that would further reduce project GHG emissions such as compliance with the California Green Building Standards Code and the installation of rooftop photovoltaic panels. As such, the project would not be inconsistent with the 2022 Scoping Plan. As such, the project would not be inconsistent with the 2022 Scoping Plan. (Urban Crossroads, 2023d, p. 52)

City of Lancaster CAP Consistency

As discussed above under the analysis of Threshold VIII(a)., construction and operation of the Project would generate approximately 2,043.96 $MTCO_2e$/yr. As such, the Project would not exceed the City's GHG significance threshold of 3,000 $MTCO_2e$/yr. Furthermore, the Project's energy-saving and sustainable design features would help with the City's goal in reducing emissions and make Lancaster more sustainable. (Urban Crossroads, 2023d, p. 52).

Conclusion

Overall, the proposed project would not conflict with the City's CAP, SB 32, or any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. Impacts would be less than significant.

APPLICABLE REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS (RR) AND DESIGN FEATURES (DF)

Although the Project's GHG emissions would be less than significant, the Project Applicant has agreed to implement the following design features and regulatory requirements in order to further reduce the GHG

emissions from the Project. The City of Lancaster is required to assure that implementing development complies with the assumptions relied upon herein and applicable regulatory requirements pertaining to the topic of GHG Emissions, which include the following regulatory requirements and design features. The Project shall be conditioned to implement the following design features and regulatory requirements as part of the City's Conditions of Approval for the Project.

GHG DF-1: The Project shall implement the following measures in order to further reduce operational mobile source air pollutant emissions to the extent feasible:

- Only haul trucks meeting model year 2010 engine emission standards shall be used for the on-road transport of materials to and from the Project site.
- Legible, durable, weather-proof signs shall be placed at truck access gates, loading docks, and truck parking areas that identify applicable California Air Resources Board (CARB) anti-idling regulations. At a minimum, each sign shall include: (1) instructions for truck drivers to shut off engines when not in use; (2) instructions for drivers of diesel trucks to restrict idling to no more than 5 minutes once the vehicle is stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park," and the parking brake is engaged; and (3) telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and CARB to report violations. Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, the City of Lancaster shall conduct a site inspection to ensure that the signs are in place.
- Prior to tenant occupancy, the Project Applicant or successor in interest shall provide documentation to the City demonstrating that occupants/tenants of the Project site have been provided documentation on funding opportunities, such as the Carl Moyer Program, which provide incentives for using cleaner-than-required engines and equipment.
- The minimum number of automobile electric vehicle (EV) charging stations required by the California Code of Regulations Title 24 shall be provided. In addition, the buildings shall include electrical infrastructure sufficiently sized to accommodate the potential installation of additional auto and truck EV charging stations in the future.
- Conduit shall be installed to tractor trailer parking areas in logical locations determined by the Project Applicant during construction document plan check, for the purpose of accommodating the future installation of EV truck charging stations at such time this technology becomes commercially available.

GHG DF-2: The Project shall implement the following measure in order to further reduce operational energy source air pollutant emissions to the extent feasible:

- The Project shall include rooftop solar panels to the extent feasible, with a capacity that matches the maximum allowed for distributed solar connections to the grid.
- Install Energy Star-rated heating, cooling, lighting, and appliances.
- Provide information on energy efficiency, energy-efficient lighting and lighting control systems, energy management, and existing energy incentive programs to future tenants of the Project.
- Structures shall be equipped with outdoor electric outlets in the front and rear of the structures to facilitate use of electrical lawn and garden equipment.

GHG DF-3: The Project shall include the following language within tenant lease agreements in order to further reduce operational air pollutant emissions to the extent feasible:

- Require tenants to use the cleanest technologies available and to provide the necessary infrastructure to support zero-emission vehicles, equipment, and appliances that would be operating on site. This requirement shall apply to equipment such as forklifts, handheld landscaping equipment, yard trucks, office appliances, etc.
- Require future tenants to exclusively use zero-emission light and medium-duty delivery trucks and vans, when economically feasible.
- Tenants shall be in, and monitor compliance with, all current air quality regulations for on-road trucks including the CARB's Heavy-Duty (Tractor-Trailer) Greenhouse Gas Regulation, Periodic Smoke Inspection Program, and the Statewide Truck and Bus Regulation.
- Cold storage operations shall be prohibited unless additional environmental review, including a Health Risk Assessment, is conducted and certified pursuant to the CEQA.

GHG DF-4: Prior to the issuance of a building permit, Developer shall provide documentation to the City of Lancaster that the Project could achieve Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification and meet or exceed CalGreen Tier 2 standards in effect at the time of building permit application.

GHG DF-5: During Project construction, Developer shall comply with the following: Require all generators, and all diesel-fueled off-road construction equipment greater than 75 horsepower, to be zero-emissions or equipped with CARB Tier IV- compliant engines (as set forth in Section 2423 of Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, and Part 89 of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations) or better by including this requirement in applicable bid documents, purchase orders, and contracts with successful contractors. After either (1) the completion of grading or, (2) the completion of an electrical hookup at the site, whichever is first, require all generators and all diesel- fueled off-road construction equipment, to be zero-emissions or equipped with CARB Tier IV- compliant engines (as set forth in Section 2423 of Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, and Part 89 of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations) or better by including this requirement in applicable bid documents, purchase orders, and contracts with successful contractors. An exemption from these requirements may be granted by the City in the event that the applicant documents that equipment with the required tier is not reasonably available and corresponding reductions in criteria air pollutant emissions are achieved from other construction equipment. (For example, if a Tier 4 Final piece of equipment is not reasonably available at the time of construction and a lower tier equipment is used instead (e.g., Tier 4 interim), another piece of equipment could be upgraded from a Tier 4 Final to a higher tier (i.e., Tier 5) or replaced with an alternative-fueled (not diesel-fueled) equipment to offset the emissions associated with using a piece of equipment that does not meet Tier 4 Final standards). Before an exemption may be considered by the City, the applicant shall be required to demonstrate that at least two construction fleet owners/operators in the Los Angeles County Region were contacted and that those owners/operators confirmed Tier 4 Final or better equipment could not be located within the Los Angeles County Region. To ensure that Tier 4 Final construction equipment or better would be used during the proposed Project's construction, the applicant shall include this requirement in applicable bid documents, purchase orders, and contracts. Successful contractors must demonstrate the ability to supply the compliant construction equipment for use prior to any ground- disturbing and construction activities.

(i) Provide infrastructure for zero-emission off-road construction equipment if the contractors selected to construct the Project plan to use zero -emission off-road construction equipment.

(ii) Provide electrical hook ups to the power grid, rather than diesel-fueled generators, for contractors' electric construction tools, such as saws, drills and compressors. In applicable bid documents and contracts with contractors selected to construct the Project, include language requiring all off-road equipment with a power rating below 19 kilowatts (e.g., plate compactors, pressure washers, etc.) used during Project construction to be electric. not in use.

(iii) Require construction equipment to be turned off when not in use.

(iv) Recycle and/or salvage for reuse a minimum of 65 percent of the nonhazardous construction and demolition waste in accordance with Section 5.408.1 of the California Green Building Standards Code Part 11.

(v) On days when the hourly average wind speed for the City of Lancaster exceeds 20 miles per hour, additional dust control measures shall be implemented, such as increased surface watering. Grading and excavation shall be prohibited when sustained wind speed exceeds 30 miles per hour.

(vi) Apply and maintain surface treatments (such as PURETi Coat or PlusTi) on impervious ground surfaces that lessen impervious surface-related radiative forcing.

(vii) Use paints, architectural coatings, and industrial maintenance coatings for all interior painting that have volatile organic compound levels of less than 10 g/L.

GHG DF-6: During Project operation, Developer shall comply with the following:

(i) All outdoor cargo handling equipment (including yard trucks, hostlers, yard goats, pallet jacks, forklifts, and landscaping equipment) shall be zero-emission vehicles. Each building shall include the necessary charging stations or other necessary infrastructure for cargo handling equipment. The building manager or their designee shall be responsible for enforcing these requirements.

(ii) In anticipation of a transition to zero emissions truck fleets during the lifetime of the Project, install at least four heavy-duty truck vehicle charging stations on-site by 2030.

(iii) Commit to on-site solar generation sufficient to meet at least 75% of the Project's total operational energy requirements from within the building envelope.

(iv) Prior to certificate of occupancy, install conduit and infrastructure for Level 2 (or faster) electric vehicle charging stations on-site for employees for the percentage of employee parking spaces commensurate with Title 24 requirements in effect at the time of building permit issuance plus additional charging stations equal to 5% of the total employee parking spaces in the building permit, whichever is greater. By 2030, install Level 2 (or faster) electric vehicle charging stations for 25% of the employee parking spaces required warehouse facilities.

(v) Install HVAC and/or HEPA air filtration systems in all warehouse facilities.

(vi) Install a rooftop solar array that has the capacity to provide a minimum of 2,000 AMPS (which is the maximum peak power amount) of the Project.

(vii) Prior to tenant occupancy, provide documentation to the City of Lancaster demonstrating that occupants/tenants of the Project site have been provided documentation that:

- Recommends the use of electric or alternatively fueled sweepers with high efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filters;
- Recommends the use of water-based or low VOC cleaning; and
- For occupants with more than 250 employees, require the establishment of a transportation demand management program to reduce employee commute vehicle emissions.

GHG DF-7: Include contractual language in tenant lease agreements requiring that any facility operator shall:

- Ensure that site enforcement staff in charge of keeping the daily log and monitoring for excess idling will be trained/certified in diesel health effects and technologies, for example, by requiring attendance at California Air Resources Board-approved courses (such as the free, one-day Course #512);
- Be required to train managers and employees on efficient scheduling and load management to eliminate unnecessary queuing and idling of trucks. The building manager or their designee shall be responsible for enforcing these requirements; and
- Be in, and monitor compliance with, all current air quality regulations for on-road trucks including CARB's Heavy-Duty (Tractor-Trailer) Greenhouse Gas Regulation, Periodic Smoke Inspection Program (PSIP), and the Statewide Truck and Bus Regulation.

IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

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

a-b. **Less than Significant Impact**.

Implementation of the project would result in the construction and long-term operation of one building for light industrial and general warehouse use. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), was prepared by Consolidated Consulting Group, LLC. (CCG) and is included as *Technical Appendix G.* The de minimis conditions observed consisted of several debris piles/dump sites along with scattered windblown debris throughout the project site. Significant areas of dumped asphalt rubble were observed in the southeast corner of the project site and concrete rubble along the central east portion of the project site. No staining or other obvious evidence of petroleum product/hazardous substance releases were observed in or around the debris, thus the observed debris is considered a de minimis condition. Prior to development, the debris would be removed and disposed of appropriately. (CCG, 2022, p. 6)

The project site does not contain any evidence of recognized environmental conditions (RECs), historical recognized environmental conditions (HRECs), or controlled recognized environmental conditions (CRECs). The project site does contain evidence of a business environmental risk (BER) including two areas of encroachment on the project site from the adjacent properties to the north and east. A portion of the storage yard for the former UPS facility encroaches onto the project site. CCG was unable to make detailed observations of the former UPS facility, but based on perimeter observations, materials stored within the encroachment area include semi-trailers, mobile generators and tractor under carriages. CCG did not observe evidence of the storage of significant quantities of hazardous materials or petroleum products or evidence of stained soil or past releases of hazardous materials or petroleum products within the UPS encroachment area. The UPS facility is listed on several environmental databases reviewed as a part of CCG's assessment, most notably the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Non-generator database and multiple underground storage tank (UST) related databases. None of the database listings contain information indicative of significant releases of hazardous materials or petroleum products from the facility. Additionally, a portion of the storage yard for the adjacent east tractor-trailer parking facility encroaches onto the project site. CCG was unable to make detailed observations of the tractor-trailer parking facility, but based on perimeter observations, materials stored within the encroachment area include semi-trailers, mobile homes, multiple passenger vehicles, construction equipment, a propane tank, various storage containers, used tires and scrap building materials. CCG did not observe evidence of the storage of significant quantities of hazardous materials or petroleum products or evidence of stained soil or past releases of hazardous materials or petroleum products within the tractor-trailer parking facility encroachment area. The tractor-trailer parking facility is not listed on any of the environmental databases reviewed as part of CCG's assessment. Prior to development, the storage items would be removed, and underlying soils would be inspected for signs of staining or past releases. If stained soils or indications of past releases are identified, appropriate measures would be taken including soil sampling, removal, and/or disposal and regulatory reporting. (CCG, 2022, pp. 5-6) As such, there are no conditions associated with the existing condition of the project site or surroundings that would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, disposal, or accidental release of hazardous materials. Accordingly, no impact would occur associated with the existing conditions of the project site.

Impact Analysis for Temporary Construction-Related Activities

Heavy equipment such as dozers, excavators, and tractors would be operated on the project site during construction of the Project. This heavy equipment likely would be fueled and maintained by petroleum-based substances such as diesel fuel, gasoline, oil, and hydraulic fluid, which are considered hazardous if improperly stored or handled. In addition, materials such as paints, adhesives, solvents, and other substances typically used in building construction would be used on the project site during construction. Improper use, storage, or transportation of hazardous materials can result in accidental releases or spills, potentially posing health risks to workers, the public, and the environment. This is a standard risk on all construction sites, and there would be no greater risk for improper handling, transportation, or spills associated with the project than would occur on any other similar construction site. Construction contractors would be required to comply with all applicable federal, State, and local laws and regulations regarding the transport, use, and storage of hazardous construction-related materials, including, but not limited to, requirements imposed by the EPA and DTSC, as well as the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). With mandatory compliance with applicable hazardous materials regulations, the project would not create significant hazard to the public or the environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during the construction phase or 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. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant during temporary construction-related activities.

Impact Analysis for Long-Term Operation

The building would be occupied by a light industrial and warehouse user and it is possible that hazardous materials could be used during the course of daily operations. State and federal Community-Right-to-Know laws allow public access to information about the amounts and types of chemicals in use at local businesses. Laws also are in place that require businesses to plan and prepare for possible chemical emergencies. Any business that occupies the proposed building on the project site and that handles hazardous materials (as defined in Section 25500 of California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95) would require a permit from the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Health Hazardous Materials Division (HHMD) in order to register the business as a hazardous materials handler. Such businesses also are required to comply with California's Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Law, which requires immediate reporting to the Los Angeles County Fire Department and the State Office of Emergency Services regarding any release or threatened release of a hazardous material, regardless of the amount handled by the business. In addition, any business handling at any one time, greater than 500 pounds of solid, 55 gallons of liquid, or 200 cubic feet of gaseous hazardous material, is required, under Assembly Bill 2185 (AB 2185), to file a Hazardous Materials Business Emergency Plan (HMBEP). A HMBEP is a written set of procedures and information created to help minimize the effects and extent of a release or threatened release of a hazardous material. The intent of the HMBEP is to satisfy federal and State Community Right-To-Know laws and to provide detailed information for use by emergency responders.

If businesses that use or store hazardous materials occupy the building on the project site, they would be required to comply with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations to ensure proper use, storage, use, emission, and disposal of hazardous substances (as described above). With compliance with existing regulations, the project is not expected to pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, storage, emission, or disposal of hazardous materials, nor would the project increase the potential for accident conditions which could result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment or 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. With compliance with existing regulations, potential hazardous materials impacts associated with long-term operation of the project would be less than significant.

c. **No Impact.**

No schools exist within one-quarter mile of the proposed Project site. The nearest school site facility to the project site is the Assurance Learning Academy (a non-profit, non-traditional high school program) located at 43145 Business Center Parkway, located approximately 3,100 feet northeast of the project site (Google Earth, 2022) (Assurance Learning Academy, n.d.). As discussed above in the analysis for IX.a and IX.b, the use of and transport of hazardous substances or materials to and from the project site during temporary construction and long-term operational activities would be required to comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations that would preclude substantial public safety hazards. With mandatory regulatory compliance, no impact would occur.

d. **No Impact.**

Based on the results of the project's Phase I ESA , the project site is not located on any list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. (CCG, 2022, p. 26). Accordingly, no impact would occur.

e. **Less than Significant Impact**.

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public/private airport. Accordingly, no impact would occur.

f. **Less than Significant Impact.**

The project site does not contain any emergency facilities, nor does it serve as an emergency evacuation route; however, it is in the immediate vicinity of an evacuation route (Sierra Highway). During construction and operation of the project, adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles would be required to be maintained along public streets in the vicinity of the project site. Furthermore, improvements planned as part of the project are not anticipated to adversely affect traffic operations in the local area. As part of the City's discretionary review process, the County of Los Angeles Fire Department Fire Prevention Division Land Development Unit reviewed the project's application materials to ensure that appropriate emergency ingress and egress would be available to and from the project site and that circulation on the project site was adequate for emergency vehicles. The project's plans include Fire Notes and a Fire Access Site Plan and exhibits all reviewed by the Fire Department. The County of Los Angeles Fire Department Fire Prevention Division requires the Fire Apparatus Access Road shall provide a minimum unobstructed width of 28 feet, exclusive of shoulders and an unobstructed vertical clearance "clear to sky" due to the building height exceeding a distance of 30 feet between the fire apparatus access road and the highest roof surface. The Fire Apparatus Access Road shall be located between 10 feet and 30 feet from the building and shall be positioned parallel to one entire side of the building. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

g. **No Impact**.

According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), the project site is not located in or near State Responsibility Areas (SRAs) or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones (VHFHSZ). (CAL FIRE, n.d.) Neither CAL FIRE or the City of Lancaster identify the project site as being located within an area susceptible to wildland fires and areas surrounding the site, with the exception to the west and south of the project site, generally consist of developed land uses. Accordingly, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildlife fires. Nonetheless, the proposed building would be equipped with Early Suppression Fast Response (ESFR) fire sprinkler systems and fire hydrants would be installed on the property to ensure an adequate level of fire protection. Further, the building is proposed to be constructed with concrete tilt up walls, and concrete is not combustible. Additionally, the project site is located within the service boundaries of an existing fire station and additional fire stations are located in the vicinity which can respond in the event of a fire. Therefore, no impact associated with wildfire would occur.

X. Hydrology and Water Quality

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

a. <u>Less than Significant Impact.</u>

A Hydrology Study was prepared for the project by Sikand Engineering Associates and is included as *Technical Appendix H.*. (Sikand, 2022)

The project site does not contain any surface water drainage or ponding features. The closest drainage feature is Amargosa Creek, a desert wash that is typically dry, and is located approximately 0.23-mile west of the project site (Google Earth, 2022).

Construction-Related Water Quality

Construction of the project would involve grading, paving, utility installation, building construction, and landscaping installation; all of these activities would have the potential to generate water-borne pollutants such as silt, debris, chemicals, paints, and other solvents with the potential to affect water quality. Therefore, short-term water quality impacts have the potential to occur during the project's construction in the absence of any protective or avoidance measures. The project site is located within the jurisdiction of the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Pursuant to the requirements of the Lahontan RWQCB, the project applicant would be required to obtain a NPDES Municipal Storm Water Permit (MS4) for construction activities. The NPDES permit is required for all projects that include construction activities, such as clearing, soil stockpiling, grading, and/or excavation that disturb at least one acre of total land area. In addition, the project would be required to comply with the Lahontan RWQCB's Basin Plan. Compliance with the NPDES Permit and the Basin Plan involves the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP for construction-related activities, including grading. The SWPPP would specify the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that the project would be required to implement during construction activities to ensure that all potential pollutants of concern are prevented, minimized, and/or otherwise appropriately treated prior to being discharged from the subject property. The proposed project would incorporate appropriate BMPs as determined by the City of Lancaster Public Works Department. Mandatory compliance with the SWPPP would ensure that the project does not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during construction activities. Therefore, water quality impacts associated with construction activities would be less than significant.

Post-Development Water Quality

Following construction, the project site would be landscaped and covered with impervious surfaces. The project includes an onsite privately maintained storm drain system and a retention basin located along the western portion of the project site to reduce post-development peak flow from the site. The site outflow would be directed into the same existing condition outlet area through the basin spillway, thus following the flow conveyance from the existing condition. (Sikand, 2022, p. 4)

Post-construction maintenance and operational measures would be necessary to ensure ongoing erosion protection. The proposed project would not therefore result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil during operation. Impacts would be less than significant. Compliance with the NPDES Permit would further reduce water quality impacts during long-term operation of the project to below significant levels. Therefore, long-term use of the project site would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. **Less than Significant Impact.**

The project would not install any water wells and would not directly extract groundwater. Water supplied to the project site would be obtained from the Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40 (LACWD, 2021). The project would install impervious surfaces and thus increase the impervious surface cover of the site, which could reduce the amount of water percolating down into the groundwater basin that underlies the project area. However, the storm drain system and a retention basin that are incorporated into the project site design would minimize potential adverse effects related to groundwater recharge. Therefore, with buildout of the project, the local groundwater levels would not be adversely affected. Therefore, impacts to groundwater supplies and recharge would be less than significant.

c. **Less than Significant Impact**.

Construction-Related Erosion Impacts

Construction of the Project would involve substantial ground disturbance during clearing and grading of the site. The proposed grading activities would generate silt which could be carried off-site during a heavy rainfall event. Should such an event occur in the absence of any preventative measures to contain silt and other soils on-site, erosion and/or siltation downstream could result. However, pursuant to requirements of the Lahontan RWQCB, the project applicant would be required to obtain a NPDES permit for construction activities on-site. The NPDES permit is required for all projects that include construction activities, such as clearing, grading, and/or excavation that disturb at least one acre of total land area. Compliance with the NPDES permit involves the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP for construction related activities. The SWPPP would specify BMPs to minimize the potential for erosion and siltation to occur and would include specific project site measures to address the potential for the caving in of temporary excavations. Typical BMPs that are implemented at construction sites to protect water quality include the implementation of straw bale barriers, plastic sheeting/erosion control blankets, and outlet protection measures. With mandatory adherence to the SWPPP requirements, impacts associated with erosion during temporary construction activities would be less than significant.

Post-Development Erosion Impacts

Following construction, wind and water erosion on the project site would be minimal because the areas disturbed during construction would be landscaped or covered with impervious surfaces. Surface water runoff from the project site would be captured by a series of catch basins and treated by an on-site storm drain system which will drain to and be treated by a proposed open retention basin located along the western portion of the project site. Therefore, because runoff generated on the developed portions of the site would be routed to the proposed retention basin, the project would not contribute runoff to off-site areas that may increase erosion hazards off site and thus impacts would be less than significant.

Development of the proposed project would increase the amount of surface water runoff due to the impervious surfaces of the building along with its associated paved parking areas. However, the project's onsite drainage design concept would provide flood protection to the proposed building pad. Additionally, the storm drain system and combination open retention basin would reduce peak flow from the project site. Outflow from the project site would be directed into the same existing condition outlet area through the basin spillway which would thus follow the flow conveyance from the existing project site conditions. (Sikand, 2022, p. 4) Additionally, according to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate (FIRM) Panel 06037C0420F, the project site is designated as Flood Zone X (unshaded), an area defined as minimal flood hazard (located outside both the 100-year and 500-year flood zone) (FEMA, 2023). Therefore, because the project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-site or off-site, impacts would be less than significant.

d. **No impact.**

According to the FEMA FIRM Panel 06037C0420F, the project site is located in Flood Zone X (unshaded), an area of minimal flood hazard. As discussed previously, the project's onsite drainage design concept would provide flood protection to the proposed building pad, and the storm drain system and retention basin would reduce peak flow from the project site.

The project site is located approximately 49 miles northeast from the Pacific Ocean and is therefore not subject to a tsunami (Google Earth, 2022). The nearest large body of surface water to the project site is Lake Palmdale, located approximately 6.96 miles south of the project site (Google Earth, 2022). Seiching occurs when seismic groundshaking induces standing waves (seiches) inside of water retention facilities, such as reservoirs and water tanks. These waves can cause the retention structures to fail and flood downstream properties. Due to the distance from this body of water and the intervening structures, seiching would not impact the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur with respect to tsunamis or seiche.

e. **Less than Significant Impact**.

The project site is located within the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin. The Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin is exempt from the requirements of the SGMA, and no regional groundwater management plan currently exists for the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin. The Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin was deemed a low-priority basin by DWR. As such, the project has no potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of a sustainable groundwater management plan, and no impact would occur. For more information, the reader is referred to Item X.a. No impact would occur as a result of implementation of the project.

XI. Land Use and Planning

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted or the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a. **No Impact**.

The proposed project entails the construction and operation of a 217,700 square foot building for light industrial and warehouse uses on an approximately 10.56-acres. The project site is vacant and undeveloped land, surrounded by a mix of undeveloped land, commercial properties, and industrial facilities. The project site does not occur within or adjacent to an established community, nor is it located near an existing established community thus, development of the project site as proposed would not physically divide any established community. In addition, the project would connect to the existing roadway system and other infrastructure and would not involve the reconfiguration of streets that could have the potential to alter the surrounding pattern of future development and affect the connectivity of existing uses. Because the project site is not surrounded by or located within the vicinity of an established community, the proposed project would have no potential to disrupt or physically divide an established community and no impact would occur.

b. **Less than Significant Impact**.

The proposed project is consistent with the property's LI land use designation assigned by the City's General Plan and the LI zoning classification assigned by the City's Zoning Code. The project was evaluated for consistency with applicable General Plan and Municipal Code policies and it was determined that the project would be consistent with or otherwise would not conflict with the applicable policies of the General Plan or the City's Municipal Code. Table 6, *General Plan Consistency Analysis*, provides a consistency analysis of the proposed project with respect to the relevant goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan. In addition to the City's General Plan, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) adopts a Regional Transportation/Sustainable Conservation Strategy (RTP/SCS) every five years. On May 7, 2020 SCAG adopted by the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, known as Connect SoCal, for federal transportation conformity purposes only. On September 3, 2020 SCAG adopted Connect SoCal for all other purposes. The RTP/SCS identifies ten regional goals; these goals are identified in Table 7, *Connect SoCal Consistency Analysis*, along with the project's consistency with these goals. The project is consistent with the goals, policies, and objectives of the City's General Plan and has no potential to result in significant land use and planning conflicts in the context of compliance with applicable environmental plans, policies, and regulations beyond those identified in other sections of this MND. As the proposed project does not involve the provision or housing nor is housing permitted under the light industrial zoning, a consistency analysis with the Housing Element was not conducted. There are no other land use plans, land use policies, or land use regulations applicable to the project site. Therefore, the project would not 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; thus, no impact would occur.

Table 6 General Plan Consistency Analysis

GOALS, POLICES AND OBJECTIVES	CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS
Policy 3.1.1: Ensure that development does not adversely affect the groundwater supply.	No ground water pumping will occur as part of the proposed project. All water supplied to the development will be provided by Los Angeles County Waterworks District #40 in accordance with existing regulations and agreements.
Policy 3.2.1: Promote the use of water conservation measures in the landscape plans of new developments.	The landscaping proposed as part of the proposed project would be aesthetically pleasing and native/drought tolerant in accordance with the City of Lancaster's Municipal Code, Section 8.50.
Policy 3.2.5: Promote the use of water conservation measures in the design of new developments.	The landscaping associated with the proposed development will utilize drought tolerant plants and irrigation systems that are appropriate to the specific plants.
Policy 3.3.1: Minimize the amount of vehicular miles traveled.	The proposed development will provide another source of jobs for the local economy. This will allow residents to work in the Antelope Valley instead of commuting to the Los Angeles basin for work. This would reduce the amount of VMT generated for work-based trips.
Policy 3.3.3: Minimize air pollutant emissions by new and existing development.	The proposed project could comply with all air district regulations regarding air emissions and dust control.
Policy 3.4.4: Ensure that development proposals, including City sponsored projects, are analyzed for short- and long-term impacts to biological resources and that appropriate mitigation measures are implemented.	Section IV of this initial study discusses the biological resources on the project site and identifies mitigation measures to ensure impacts to these resources are less than significant.
Policy 3.5.1: Minimize erosion problems resulting from development activities.	The proposed project will comply with all dust control and erosion measures. These include best management practices as identified in NPDES and the air quality regulations pertaining to dust control.
Policy 3.5.2: Since certain soils in the Lancaster study area have exhibited shrink-swell behavior and a potential for fissuring, and subsidence may exist in other areas, minimize the potential for damage resulting from the occurrence of soils movements.	A geotechnical study is required to be prepared by a registered professional engineer and submitted to the City as part of the grading and building plans. All recommendations within the study are required to be followed.
Policy 3.6.1: Reduce energy consumption by establishing land use patterns which would decrease automobile travel and increase the use of energy efficient modes of transportation.	The proposed project would be built in an area that has been designated for industrial type uses. It would provide additional job opportunities for local residents which would reduce the amount of energy consumed on transportation.
Policy 3.6.2: Encourage innovate building, site design, and orientation techniques which minimize energy use.	The proposed project would be constructed in accordance with the Uniform Building Code and the California Green Building Code.
Policy 3.6.3: Encourage the incorporation of energy conservation measures in existing and new structures.	The proposed project would be constructed in accordance with the Uniform Building Code and the California Green Building Code.
Policy 3.6.6: Consider and promote the use of alternative energy such as wind energy and solar energy.	The proposed project would obtain its energy from Lancaster Choice Energy which provides energy from a variety of sources including wind and solar. Additionally, the

	proposed project would be able to install solar panels to provide behind the meter solar energy for the power.
Policy 3.8.1: Preserve views of surrounding ridgelines, slope areas, and hilltops, as well as other scenic vistas.	The proposed project would not block the views of any scenic resources available from the project site or surrounding roadways.
Policy 4.3.1: Ensure that noise-sensitive land uses and noise generators are located and designed in such a manner that City noise objectives will be achieved.	The proposed development meets the noise standards of the City's General Plan.
Policy 4.5.1: Ensure that activities within the City of Lancaster transport, use, store, and dispose of hazardous materials in a responsible manner which protects the public health and safety.	The proposed project may utilize some common hazardous materials during its operations including oils/lubricants, pesticides, cleaning agents, etc. All use would be in accordance with applicable rules and regulations. Additionally, no fueling operations would take place on the project site.
Policy 4.7.2: Ensure that the design of new development minimizes the potential for fire.	The proposed project would be developed in accordance with all applicable fire code regulations. Additionally, fire hydrants would be installed both on/off site and the site is within the service boundaries of several fire stations.
Policy 9.1.2: Maintain ongoing, open communication with area school districts, and take a proactive role to ensure that communication is maintained.	All projects are routed to the appropriate school districts for review to ensure that they can adequately provide for any new students as a result of development projects.
Policy 15.1.2: Cooperate with local water agencies to provide an adequate water supply system to meet the standards for domestic and emergency needs.	The proposed project would obtain its water from Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40 in accordance with existing regulations and requirements.
Policy 15.3.1: Direct growth to areas with adequate existing facilities and services, areas which have adequate facilities and services committed, or areas where public services and facilities can be economically extended.	The necessary utilities and services to support the proposed project are located within vicinity of the site or can be easily extended to serve the project site.
Goal 16: To promote economic self-sufficiency and a fiscally solvent and financially stable community.	The proposed project would provide additional jobs and revenues associated with the construction and operation of the facility.
Policy 16.3.1: Promote development patterns which will minimize the costs of infrastructure development, public facilities development and municipal service cost delivery.	The project site is located within an area that is designated for industrial uses and has the appropriate infrastructure to support those uses.
Policy 17.1.4: Provide for office and industrial based employment-generating lands which are highly accessible and compatible with other uses in the community.	The project site is located within an area that is designated for industrial uses and has the appropriate infrastructure to support those uses.
Policy 18.2.2: Encourage appropriate development to locate so that municipal services can be efficiently provided.	The project site is located within an area that is designated for industrial uses and has the appropriate infrastructure to support those uses.

Table 7 Connect SoCal Consistency Analysis

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

XII. Mineral Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a. **No Impact**.

The City of Lancaster General Plan MEA Figure 2-4 shows that the project site and surrounding area is located outside of the City's designated Mineral Reserve Zone and contains no known mineral resources (City of Lancaster, 2009b, p. 2.9) Because the site is not located within an area known for mineral resources that are of value to the region and the residents of the State, no impact would occur.

b. **No Impact**.

The project site has a General Plan land use designation of LI and does not have a designation or zoning for mining. Additionally, the project site is not located within an area designated by the City as a Mineral Reserve Zone. Therefore, there is no potential for the project to 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; thus no impact would occur.

XIII. Noise

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a. **Less than Significant Impact**.

Urban Crossroads prepared a Noise and Vibration Analysis (NVA) for the proposed project, included as *Technical Appendix I.*(Urban Crossroads, 2023e)

Under CEQA, consideration must be given to the magnitude of a project's noise level increase, the existing baseline ambient noise levels, and the location of noise-sensitive receivers to determine if a noise increase represents a significant adverse environmental impact. In summary, noise impacts would be considered significant if, as a direct result of the proposed project, any of the significance criteria summarized in Table 8, *Significance Criteria Summary*, is exceeded. Refer to *Technical Appendix I*, Section 4, for a detailed explanation of the methodology used in determining the thresholds of significance. (Urban Crossroads, 2023e, pp. 19-21)

Table 8 Significance Criteria Summary

Analysis	Receiving Land Use	Condition(s)	Significance Criteria	
			Daytime	Nighttime
Off-Site Traffic	Noise-Sensitive[1]	If ambient is < 60 dBA CNEL	≥ 5 dBA CNEL Project increase	
		If ambient is 60 - 65 dBA CNEL	≥ 3 dBA CNEL Project increase	
		If ambient is > 65 dBA CNEL	≥ 1.5 dBA CNEL Project increase	
	Non-Noise-Sensitive[2]	If ambient is > 70 dBA CNEL	≥ 3 dBA CNEL Project increase	
Operational	Residential[3]	Exterior Noise Standards	50 dBA L_{eq}	45 dBA L_{eq}
	Commercial[3]		60 dBA L_{eq}	55 dBA L_{eq}
	Industrial[3]		70 dBA L_{eq}	70 dBA L_{eq}
	Noise-Sensitive	If ambient is < 60 dBA Leq[1]	≥ 5 dBA L_{eq} Project increase	
		If ambient is 60 - 65 dBA Leq[1]	≥ 3 dBA L_{eq} Project increase	
		If ambient is > 65 dBA Leq[1]	≥ 1.5 dBA L_{eq} Project increase	
Construction	Noise-Sensitive	Noise Level Threshold[4]	80 dBA L_{eq}	70 dBA L_{eq}
		Vibration Level Threshold[5]	0.3 PPV (in/sec)	

[1] FICON, 1992.

[2] The City of Lancaster General Plan Safety Element Noise Compatible Land Use Objectives (Exhibit 3-A of the NVA (Technical Appendix I))

[4] Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual.

[5] Caltrans Transportation and Construction Vibration Manual, April 2020 Table 19

"Daytime" = 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.; "Nighttime" = 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.; "PPV" = peak particle velocity

(Urban Crossroads, 2023e, Table 4-1)

Construction Noise Impact Analysis

To evaluate whether the project would generate potentially significant short-term noise levels at the nearest receiver locations, a construction-related daytime noise level threshold of 80 dBA L_{eq} is used as a reasonable threshold to assess the daytime construction noise level impacts. As shown on Table 9, *Construction Noise Levels,* the construction noise analysis shows that the nearest receiver locations would experience noise levels below the daytime 80 dBA L_{eq} significance threshold during Project construction activities. Therefore, the noise impacts due to Project construction noise are considered less than significant at all receiver locations. (Urban Crossroads, 2023e, pp. 50-51) For a description of the receiver locations (R1 through R-4), refer above to the topic of "Air Quality" under which the same receiver locations were analyzed and are described.

Table 9 Construction Noise Levels

Receiver Location[1]	Construction Noise Levels (dBA L_{eq})		
	Highest Construction Noise Levels[2]	Threshold[3]	Threshold Exceeded?[4]
R1	52.7	80	No
R2	52.0	80	No
R3	54.4	80	No
R4	47.4	80	No

[1] Construction noise source and receiver locations are shown on Exhibit 10-A of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*).

[2] Highest construction noise level calculations based on distance from the construction noise source activity to the nearest receiver locations as shown on Table 10-2 of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*).

[3] Construction noise level thresholds as shown on Table 4-1 of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*).

[4] Do the estimated Project construction noise levels exceed the construction noise level threshold?

(Urban Crossroads, 2023e, Table 10-3)

During construction of the Project's proposed building, concrete pouring activities may occur during nighttime hours when hot daytime air temperatures are too hot to properly cure concrete. As shown on Table 10, *Nighttime Concrete Pour Noise Levels*, the noise levels associated with the nighttime concrete pour activities are estimated to range from 32.7 to 39.7 dBA L_{eq} and would fall below the stationary-source nighttime noise significance threshold of 70 dBA L_{eq} at all the receiver locations. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. (Urban Crossroads, 2023e, pp. 50-51)

Table 10 Nighttime Concrete Pour Noise Levels

Receiver Location[1]	Concrete Pour Construction Noise Levels (dBA L_{eq})		
	Exterior Noise Levels[2]	Nighttime Threshold[3]	Threshold Exceeded?[4]
R1	38.0	70	No
R2	37.3	70	No
R3	39.7	70	No
R4	32.7	70	No

[1] Construction noise source and receiver locations are shown on Exhibit 10-A of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*).

[2] Nighttime Concrete Pour noise model inputs are included in Appendix 10.2 of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*).

[3] Construction noise level thresholds as shown on Table 4-1 of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*).

[4] Do the estimated Project construction noise levels exceed the construction noise level threshold?

(Urban Crossroads, 2023e, Table 10-4)

In addition, to control noise impacts associated with construction, the Project would be required to comply with the LMC Section 8.24.040 which addresses construction-related noise. The LMC prohibits "any construction or repair work of any kind upon any building or structure or perform any earth excavating, filling or moving where any of the foregoing entails the use of any air compressor, jack hammer, power-driven drill, riveting machine, excavator, diesel-powered truck, tractor or other earth moving equipment, hard hammers on steel or iron or any other machine tool, device or equipment which makes loud noises within 500 feet of an occupied dwelling, apartment, hotel, mobile home or other place of residence between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. and on Sundays." (Urban Crossroads, 2023e, p. 47)

Operational Noise Impact Analysis - Stationary Noise

To demonstrate compliance with local noise regulations, the Project-only operational noise levels are evaluated against exterior noise level thresholds adjusted to reflect the ambient noise levels at the nearest noise-sensitive receiver locations. As shown on Table 11, *Operational Noise Levels,* the operational noise levels associated with the proposed Project would not exceed the daytime or nighttime exterior noise level standards. Therefore, the operational noise impacts are considered less than significant . (Urban Crossroads, 2023e, p. 44)

Table 11 Operational Noise Levels

Receiver Location[1]	Project Operational Noise Levels (dBA Leq)[2]		Noise Level Standards (dBA Leq)[3]		Noise Level Standards Exceeded?[4]	
	Daytime	Nighttime	Daytime	Nighttime	Daytime	Nighttime
R1	43.2	43.2	71.7	68.3	No	No
R2	42.5	42.5	60.1	58.7	No	No
R3	45.3	45.3	55.4	55.3	No	No
R4	39.3	39.3	71.7	68.3	No	No

[1] See Exhibit 8-A of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*) for the sensitive receiver locations.

[2] Proposed Project operational noise level calculations are included in Appendix 9-1 of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*).

[3] Exterior noise level standards adjusted to reflect the ambient noise levels (see Table 5-1 of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*)). per the County of Los Angeles County Code, Chapter 12.08 Noise Control, Section 12.08.390[B] (Appendix 3.2 of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*)).

[4] Do the estimated Project operational noise source activities exceed the noise level standards?

"Daytime" = 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.; "Nighttime" = 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

(Urban Crossroads, 2023e, Table 9-4)

As indicated in Table 12, *Daytime Project Operational Noise Level Increases*, the Project would generate daytime operational noise level increases ranging from 0.0 to 0.4 dBA L_{eq} at the nearest receiver locations. As indicated in Table 13,

Nighttime Operational Noise Level Increases, the Project would generate nighttime operational noise level increases ranging from 0.0 to 0.4 dBA L_{eq} at the nearest receiver locations. Because the Project-related operational noise level increases would not exceed the operational noise level increase significance thresholds, the increases at the sensitive receiver locations would be less than significant. (Urban Crossroads, 2023e, p. 45)

Table 12 Daytime Project Operational Noise Level Increases

Receiver Location[1]	Total Project Operational Noise Level[2]	Measurement Location[3]	Reference Ambient Noise Levels[4]	Combined Project and Ambient[5]	Project Increase[6]	Increase Criteria[7]	Increase Criteria Exceeded?
R1	43.2	L1	71.7	71.7	0.0	1.5	No
R2	42.5	L2	60.1	60.2	0.1	5.0	No
R3	45.3	L3	55.4	55.8	0.4	5.0	No
R4	39.3	L4	71.7	71.7	0.0	1.5	No

[1] See Exhibit 8-A of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*) for the sensitive receiver locations.

[2] Total Project daytime operational noise levels as shown on Table 9-2 of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*).

[3] Reference noise level measurement locations as shown on Exhibit 5-A of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*).

[4] Observed daytime ambient noise levels as shown on Table 5-1 of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*).

[5] Represents the combined ambient conditions plus the Project activities.
[6] The noise level increase expected with the addition of the proposed Project activities.
[7] Significance increase criteria as shown on Table 4-1 of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*).
(Urban Crossroads, 2023e, Table 9-5)

Table 13 Nighttime Operational Noise Level Increases

Receiver Location[1]	Total Project Operational Noise Level[2]	Measurement Location[3]	Reference Ambient Noise Levels[4]	Combined Project and Ambient[5]	Project Increase[6]	Increase Criteria[7]	Increase Criteria Exceeded?
R1	43.2	L1	71.7	71.7	0.0	1.5	No
R2	42.5	L2	60.1	60.2	0.1	5.0	No
R3	45.3	L3	55.4	55.8	0.4	5.0	No
R4	39.3	L4	71.7	71.7	0.0	1.5	No

[1] See Exhibit 8-A of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*) of Technical Appendix for the sensitive receiver locations.
[2] Total Project nighttime operational noise levels as shown on Table 9-3 of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*).
[3] Reference noise level measurement locations as shown on Exhibit 5-A of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*).
[4] Observed nighttime ambient noise levels as shown on Table 5-1 of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*).
[5] Represents the combined ambient conditions plus the Project activities.
[6] The noise level increase expected with the addition of the proposed Project activities.
[7] Significance increase criteria as shown on Table 4-1 of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*).
(Urban Crossroads, 2023e, Table 9-6)

Off-Site Traffic Noise Analysis

Traffic generated by the operation of the Project would influence the traffic noise levels in surrounding off-site areas and at the Project site. An analysis of existing traffic noise levels plus traffic noise generated by the proposed Project has been included for informational purposes and to fully analyze all the existing traffic scenarios identified in the Project's Traffic Impact Analysis. However, the analysis of existing off-site traffic noise levels plus traffic noise generated by the proposed Project scenario would not actually occur since the Project would not be fully constructed and operational until Year 2024 conditions.

As shown in Table 14, *Existing with Project Traffic Noise Level Increases*, Project off-site traffic noise level increases range from a high of 12.3 dBA CNEL on Avenue L4 and 0.0 to 2.0 on all other study area roadway segments. Based on the significance criteria for off-site traffic noise, land uses adjacent to the study area roadway segments would experience less than significant noise level increases on receiving land uses due to the Project-related traffic. (Urban Crossroads, 2023e, pp. 33-34)

Table 14 Existing with Project Traffic Noise Level Increases

ID	Road	Segment	Receiving Land Use[1]	CNEL at Receiving Land Use (dBA)[2]			Incremental Noise Level Increase Threshold[3]	
				No Project	With Project	Project Increment	Limit	Exceeded?
1	Sierra Hwy.	n/o W Avenue L	Non-Sensitive	74.6	74.7	0.1	3.0	No
2	Sierra Hwy.	s/o E Avenue L	Non-Sensitive	75.1	75.5	0.4	3.0	No
3	Sierra Hwy.	n/o Avenue L	Non-Sensitive	75.4	75.7	0.3	3.0	No
4	Sierra Hwy.	s/o Avenue L	Non-Sensitive	72.0	72.2	0.2	3.0	No
5	West Avenue L	w/o Sierra Hwy	Non-Sensitive	61.8	63.8	2.0	n/a	No
6	East Avenue L	w/o Sierra Hwy	Non-Sensitive	60.4	60.4	0.0	n/a	No
7	Avenue L4	w/o Sierra Hwy	Non-Sensitive	49.3	61.6	12.3	n/a	No

[1] Based on a review of existing aerial imagery. Noise sensitive uses limited to existing residential land uses.

[2] The CNEL is calculated at the boundary of the right-of-way of each roadway and the property line of the receiving land use.

[3] Does the Project create an incremental noise level increase exceeding the significance criteria?

"n/a" Per the County of Los Angeles General Plan Noise Element Table N-1, a barely perceptible 3 dBA or greater noise level increase is considered a significant impact when the ambient non-noise sensitive noise level is greater than the normally acceptable 70 dBA CNEL land use compatibility criteria.

(Urban Crossroads, 2023e, Table 7-5)

An Existing plus Ambient Growth plus Cumulative Projects (EAC) plus the proposed Project scenario was evaluated to calculate estimated opening year traffic noise. As shown in Table 15*, EAC with Project Traffic Noise Level Increases*, EAC plus Project off-site traffic noise level increases would range from 0.0 to 12.3 dBA CNEL. Based on the significance criteria for off-site traffic noise, land uses adjacent to the study area roadway segments would experience less than significant noise level increases on receiving land uses due to the Project-related traffic under EAC traffic conditions. (Urban Crossroads, 2023e, p. 35)

Table 15 EAC with Project Traffic Noise Level Increases

ID	Road	Segment	Receiving Land Use[1]	CNEL at Receiving Land Use (dBA)[2]			Incremental Noise Level Increase Threshold[3]	
				No Project	With Project	Project Increment	Limit	Exceeded?
1	Sierra Hwy.	n/o W Avenue L	Non-Sensitive	75.1	75.2	0.1	3.0	No
2	Sierra Hwy.	s/o E Avenue L	Non-Sensitive	75.7	76.1	0.4	3.0	No
3	Sierra Hwy.	n/o Avenue L4	Non-Sensitive	76.2	76.5	0.3	3.0	No
4	Sierra Hwy.	s/o Avenue L4	Non-Sensitive	73.5	73.7	0.2	3.0	No
5	West Avenue L	w/o Sierra Hwy	Non-Sensitive	62.7	64.4	1.7	n/a	No
6	East Avenue L	w/o Sierra Hwy	Non-Sensitive	61.6	61.6	0.0	n/a	No
7	Avenue L4	w/o Sierra Hwy	Non-Sensitive	49.3	61.6	12.3	n/a	No

[1] Based on a review of existing aerial imagery. Noise sensitive uses limited to existing residential land uses.

[2] The CNEL is calculated at the boundary of the right-of-way of each roadway and the property line of the receiving land use.

[3] Does the Project create an incremental noise level increase exceeding the significance criteria?

"n/a" Per the County of Los Angeles General Plan Noise Element Table N-1, a barely perceptible 3 dBA or greater noise level increase is considered a significant impact when the ambient non-noise sensitive noise level is greater than the normally acceptable 70 dBA CNEL land use compatibility criteria.

(Urban Crossroads, 2023e, Table 7-6)

b. **Less than Significant Impact**.

Construction activities on the project site would utilize heavy equipment that has the potential to generate low levels of intermittent, localized ground-borne vibration. Refer to the NVA for a detailed description of the methodology used to calculate construction vibration levels. The results of the vibration analysis for Project-related construction activities are summarized in Table 16, *Project Construction Vibration Levels.* As shown in Table 16, Project construction activity vibration velocity levels are expected to range from 0.000 to 0.223 PPV in/sec. Based on the maximum acceptable continuous vibration threshold of 0.3 PPV (in/sec), the typical project construction vibration levels would fall below the building damage thresholds at all of the noise sensitive receiver locations. Therefore, project-related vibration impacts would be less than significant during typical construction activities at the project site. (Urban Crossroads, 2023e, p. 52)

Table 16 Project Construction Vibration Levels

Receiver[1]	Distance to Const. Activity (Feet)[2]	Typical Construction Vibration Levels PPV (in/sec)[3]						Thresholds PPV (in/sec)[4]	Thresholds Exceeded?[5]
		Small bulldozer	Jackhammer	Loaded Trucks	Large bulldozer	Vibratory Roller	Highest Vibration Level		
R1	1,688’	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.3	No
R2	1,802’	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.3	No
R3	1,309’	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.3	No
R4	2,848’	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.3	No
R5	1,301'	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.3	No
R6	24'	0.003	0.037	0.081	0.095	0.223	0.223	0.3	No

[1] Construction noise source and receiver locations are shown on Exhibit 10-A of the NVA (*Technical Appendix I*).

[2] Distance from receiver location to project construction boundary (Project site boundary).

[3] Based on the Vibration Source Levels of Construction Equipment (Table 10-5 of the NIA).

[4] Caltrans Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual, April 2020, Table 19, p. 38.

[5] Does the peak vibration exceed the acceptable vibration thresholds?

"PPV" = Peak Particle Velocity

(Urban Crossroads, 2023e, Table 10-6)

Under long-term conditions, the proposed project would not include nor require equipment, facilities, or activities that would result in substantial or perceptible ground-borne vibration. Operational activities at the project site would include heavy trucks moving on site to and from the loading docks areas. According to the FTA, trucks rarely create vibration levels that exceed 70 VdB or 0.003 in/sec unless there are bumps due to frequent potholes in the road. Additionally, trucks traversing the project site would be traveling at very low speeds and would not contribute to excessive ground-borne vibration and noise levels. As such, the project’s operational activities would not expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. Accordingly, long-term operational vibration impacts would be less than significant.

c. **No Impact.**

The project site is not 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 a public use airport, No impact would occur.

XIV. Population and Housing

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a. **Less than Significant Impact.**

The project entails the development of one building for light industrial and general warehouse use in the LI zone. The proposed project does not include residential uses and therefore would not directly generate a residential population. According to the City's General Plan, a significant portion of City residents commute outside of the City for employment. Additionally, the rate of housing and population growth within the City has exceeded the rate of local employment growth (City of Lancaster, 2009a, pp. 1.20, 4.2) As such, it is anticipated that the employment base for both the construction and operational phases of the project would come from the existing population in the City of Lancaster and surrounding area. There are no components of the project that would reasonably result in indirect or unplanned population growth.

The proposed project would include the extension of Avenue L-4 and includes approximately 0.57-acre of street dedication. The proposed building would then be accessible via Avenue L-4 from Sierra Highway. It is not expected that the extension of Avenue L-4 for purposes of accessing the proposed building would induce population growth, and no additional new infrastructure is proposed. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

b. **No Impact.**

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.

XV. Public Services

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Police Protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Other Public Facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a. **Less Than Significant Impact.**

The project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with new or physically altered governmental facilities nor create a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities for any of the public services as discussed below.

Fire Protection

The project site receives fire protection services from the LACFD. Development of the project site with one building for light industrial and general warehouse use has the potential to increase the frequency of fire protection calls to the site. LACFD Station 129 is the closet fire station to the project site located approximately 1.9 roadway miles to the southwest of the site at 42110 6th St W. LACFD Station 134 is located at 43225 25th St W, approximately 3.8 roadway miles northwest of the project site, and LACFD Station 135 located at 1846 E Ave K-4, approximately 3.8 roadway miles to the northeast of the project site (Google Maps, 2023).

Although the project's increased demand on fire services could impact the LACFD's response times, the impact would be less than significant because the project would be served from existing LACFD fire stations and would not require the construction of a new fire station or physical alteration of an existing fire station. The project applicant would be required to comply with Chapter 15.76 of the LMC, which requires a Development Impact Fee (DIF) payment by developers to mitigate impacts to fire protection and emergency medical services and facilities to the LACFD (City of Lancaster, 2022b). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Police Protection

The project site receives police protection services from the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LACSD). Development of the project site with one building for light industrial and warehouse use has the potential to increase the frequency of sheriff calls to the site due to the addition of an industrial building, traffic, and workers.

The LACSD Station, located at 501 Lancaster Boulevard, approximately 1.5 roadway miles southwest from the project site, would provide sheriff services to the project site and vicinity of the site (Google Maps, 2023). As discussed in the City's General Plan, the projected population growth for the City to the year 2030 will require significant expansion of protection services as well as new facilities. Localized development increases would incrementally create demand for additional law enforcement personnel and services in specific areas; however, none of the increases would trigger the need for new or improved facilities in order to meet the demand. The additional personnel (officers, supervisors, and support staff), equipment and vehicles necessary could readily be accommodated by existing facilities. In addition, the project would comply with the existing regulatory policies and General Plan policies that would further reduce any impacts to law enforcement services associated with the project to less than significant levels.

Schools

The project site would be developed with non-residential uses that would not directly generate any school-aged children requiring public education. According to the General Plan, a significant portion of City residents commute outside of the City for employment. Additionally, the rate of housing and population growth within the City has exceeded the rate of local employment growth (City of Lancaster, 2009a, pp. 1.20, 4.2) As such, future employees of the project would likely primarily consist of existing City residents; therefore, the project would not affect the existing or projected housing supply, and thus would not generate a school-aged population in the City.

Although the project would not directly create a demand for additional public school services, the project applicant would still be required to contribute fees to the Lancaster School District (LSD) and Antelope Valley Union High School District in compliance with California Senate Bill 50 (SB 50, Greene), California Government Code §§ 65995.5 to 65998, which allows school districts to collect fees from new developments to offset the costs associated with increasing school capacity needs. The payment of school mitigation impact fees authorized by SB 50 is deemed to provide "full and complete mitigation of impacts" on school facilities from the development of real property (California Government Code § 65995). (CA Legislative Info, 1998) Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Parks

The project does not propose any type of residential use or other land use that may generate a population that would result in a demand for parkland resources, and no recreational facilities are proposed as part of the project. Although the project would not directly result in the need for new or expanded park facilities, resulting in no environmental impacts, the project could result in an incremental indirect increase in demand for parks, should the employees of the project utilize park facilities in the project area during their work hours.

Project implementation would not result in or require new or expanded park facilities. In addition, no parks are located on the site or are planned to be located on the project site, therefore, there is no potential for the project to have a direct physical impact on park services. As such, the proposed project would not directly cause or contribute to a need to construct new or physically altered park facilities and impacts would be less than significant.

Other Public Facilities

Development of the project site with one building for light industrial and warehouse use and associated site improvements would not directly create a demand for public library facilities and would not directly result in the need to modify existing or construct new library buildings. Demand placed on libraries is based on the generation

of a resident population associated with a person's place of residence, and not typically their place of employment. Based on the City-wide jobs and housing data as discussed above, the project would not result in an increase in the City's population and would therefore not directly result in an increased demand for library facilities. Accordingly, project-related impacts to library facilities would be less than significant.

There are no other public services for which project-related service demands would have the potential to physically impact public facilities. The project applicant would be required to comply with the City's DIF as cited in Chapter 15.64 of the LMC which requires a fee payment by developers for the funding of public facilities, including public libraries and other public facilities (City of Lancaster, 2022b). Impacts would be less than significant.

XVI. Recreation

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a-b. <u>No Impact.</u>

The Project does not involve any type of residential use or other land use that may generate a population that would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. Additionally, the project does not involve the construction of any new on- or off-site recreational facilities and would not expand any existing off-site recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

XVII. Transportation

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

a. **Less than Significant Impact.**

In addition to Level of Service (LOS) standards established by the General Plan, future development on the site would be required to substantially conform with the City of Lancaster General Plan Circulation Element and applicable City ordinances related to the circulation system. Per the City of Lancaster's Traffic Study Guidelines, LOS D is considered the minimum acceptable LOS for intersections within the City.

The California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA) adopted changes to the CEQA Guidelines in December 2018, which identified that starting on July 1, 2020, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is the appropriate metric to evaluate a project's transportation impacts instead of LOS. Regardless, because an LOS standard is established by the City's General Plan, a brief analysis of the Project's effects on LOS is presented herein. Refer to the Project's Traffic Analysis (*Appendix J1 to this MND*) for more detailed information.

Future user(s) of the Project's building is not known at this time. The Project's vehicle trip generation was calculated based on the projected uses of the building given its size, design features, and configuration. Trip-generation statistics published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (11th Edition, 2021) was used to estimate the trip generation. The Project would generate 480 actual two-way vehicle trips per day with 54 morning peak hour trips and 55 evening peak hour trips. The Project is expected to generate 664 two-way vehicular trips per day in terms of Passenger Car Equivalents (PCEs), including 62 PCE trips during the morning peak hour and 63 PCE trips during the evening peak hour. (Urban Crossroads, 2023f, p. 26)
(Urban Crossroads, 2023f, Table 4-2)

Vehicles traveling to and from the Project site are expected to use Sierra Highway, accessing the site via Avenue L4 (Urban Crossroads, 2023f, p. 1). The Project's TIA evaluated LOS conditions at three intersections (Sierra Highway at Avenue L West, Sierra Highway at Avenue L East, and Sierra Highway at Avenue L4) and determined that with the addition of Project traffic, the intersections would operate at an acceptable LOS for all analysis

scenarios during all evaluated peak hours. Therefore, because all study area intersections area anticipated to operate at an acceptable LOS for all analysis scenarios during all evaluated peak hours, no off-site improvements are identified by Urban Crossroads as being required for implementation of the proposed Project. (Urban Crossroads, 2023f, pp. 6-7).

Additionally, as part of their review of the proposed Project, the City of Lancaster evaluated the Project for consistency with other applicable General Plan policies as well as the requirements of applicable City ordinances, and found that the Project would not conflict with any applicable ordinances or with any of the goals and policies contained within the General Plan, including policies within the General Plan Circulation Element that relate to the circulation system, transit, roadway, bicycle, and/or pedestrian facilities. Sierra Highway Bikeway is an existing Class I (off-street) bikeway that runs parallel to Sierra Highway and is located east of the Project site but no bike routes are planned adjacent to the Project site. Based on a review of the existing transit routes within the vicinity of the proposed Project, AVTA Routes 4 and 8 run along Sierra Highway and could potentially serve the Project site. (Urban Crossroads, 2023f, pp. 17, 20). The proposed Project would be compatible with the objectives, policies, and programs specified in the General Plan and also would be in general agreement and harmony with the terms and requirements of the General Plan. Based on the preceding analysis, the proposed Project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Impacts would be less than significant

b. **Potentially Significant Impact.**

In order to evaluate the project's potential to conflict with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b), project-specific technical studies were prepared for the project by Urban Crossroads. These reports are entitled "L-4 Avenue Warehouse Vehicle Miles (VMT) Traveled Analysis" (herein, "VMT Evaluation"), and included as *Technical Appendix J2* to this MND. Provided below is a summary of the results of the VMT Evaluation.

Background

Changes to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines were adopted in December 2018, which required all lead agencies to adopt VMT as a replacement for automobile delay-based level of service (LOS) as the new measure for identifying transportation impacts for land use projects. This statewide mandate went into effect July 1, 2020. To aid in this transition, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) released a Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (December 2018; herein, "Technical Advisory"). Based on OPR's Technical Advisory, the City of Lancaster Department of Public Works adopted their Local Transportation Assessment Guidelines (January 5, 2021; "City Guidelines"). The adopted City Guidelines have been utilized to prepare the analysis contained in the project's VMT Evaluation. (Urban Crossroads, 2023g, p. 1)

VMT Screening

Consistent with City Guidelines, projects should evaluate available screening criteria based on their size and location to determine if a presumption of a less than significant transportation impact can be made. A project need only meet one screening criterion to result in a less than significant impact; however, the proposed project does not meet any of the screening criteria and thus a VMT analysis was warranted. (Urban Crossroads, 2023g, p. 2)

Modeling Methodology

The City Guidelines identify the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) model as the appropriate tool for conducting VMT analysis for land use projects in the City of Lancaster. The SCAG 2016 Regional

Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) trip-based model considers interaction between different land uses based on socio-economic data such as population, households, and employment to estimate VMT. The current SCAG model has a base year of 2012 and a forecast year of 2040 and was used to estimate VMT for existing year 2022 conditions. The 2040 model contains the planned transportation improvements in the RTP and growth projections in the SCS. (Urban Crossroads, 2023g, p. 2)

VMT Metric and Significance Threshold

When calculating VMT for a project, the VMT methodology should match the methodology used to establish the Baseline VMT metrics and impact thresholds. For industrial projects in the City of Lancaster consistent with City Guidelines, Baseline VMT is defined as a measurement of Home-Based Work (HBW) VMT per employee, which reflects all commute trips for places of employment for the Antelope Valley Planning Area (AVPA). All HBW auto vehicle VMT attracted by the project is divided by the total employment to get the efficiency metric of HBW VMT per employee. (Urban Crossroads, 2023g, pp. 2-3)

Based on City Guidelines, the City utilizes the following significance threshold for Employment (Commercial or Industrial) projects:

- Project exceeds 15% below AVPA Baseline VMT for home-based work VMT per employee.

The City Guidelines direct that the Baseline VMT applied in the VMT analysis should be consistent with the year of the analysis, or in this case 2022. Using the SCAG model base year (2016) and cumulative year (2040), the AVPA baseline (2022) VMT was calculated using straight line linear interpolation and was determined to be to be 9.1 VMT per employee. The threshold of 15% below existing AVPA would be 7.7 VMT per employee. (Urban Crossroads, 2023g, p. 3)

Project Land Use Conversion

To estimate project generated VMT, standard land use information such as total building square footage must first be converted into a SCAG travel demand forecasting model compatible dataset. The SCAG model utilizes socio-economic data (SED) (e.g., population, households, and employment) instead of land use information for the purposes of vehicle trip estimation. Land use information for the project was converted to SED and input into the project's Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) to calculate project generated HBW VMT. Table 17, Project *Employee Estimates*, summarizes the SED inputs used to reflect the project. (Urban Crossroads, 2023g, p. 3)

Table 17 Project Employee Estimates

Land Use	Quantity	Employment Factor	Employees
Industrial	215,200 s.f.	1 employee per 1,000 s.f.[1]	215
Office	2,500 s.f.	4 employees per 1,000 s.f.	10

[1] The VMT analysis used the employment ratio for Light Industrial from LA City VMT Calculator. https://ladot.lacity.org/sites/default/files/documents/vmt_calculator_documentation-2020.05.18.pdf
(Urban Crossroads, 2023g, p. 3)

Project VMT and Comparison to Impact Thresholds

HBW VMT per employee for the project was calculated for Baseline (2022) conditions using the SCAG travel demand model and is presented in Table 18, *Project HBW VMT Per Employee Adopted Thresholds*, along with the estimated number of project employees, and the resulting HBW VMT per employee. (Urban Crossroads, 2023g, p. 3)

Table 18 Project HBW VMT Per Employee Adopted Thresholds

	Project
HBW VMT	2,563
Employment	225
HBW VMT per Employee	11.3
Percent Above Threshold	46.8%
Potentially Significant?	Yes

(Urban Crossroads, 2023g, p. 3)

As shown in Table 18, the project generates 11.3 HBW VMT per employee. In comparison to the VMT threshold of 15% below Baseline VMT of the AVPA, the project is 46.8% above the currently adopted threshold, which results in a potential VMT impact. To reduce the project's potential VMT impact, the HBW VMT per employee needs to be reduced by 810 VMT[1]. This VMT reduction equates to 32%[2]. (Urban Crossroads, 2023g, pp. 3-4)

VMT Impact Fee

The City of Lancaster City Council adopted Resolution No. 23-08 on January 24, 2023, which would allow new residential and nonresidential development to mitigate their project specific VMT impacts by making a "fair share" payment to cover the cost of the identified transportation demand management (TDM) strategies and VMT-reducing projects within the City of Lancaster. The proposed fee would apply to new residential and nonresidential development in the City that are subject to a VMT analysis under CEQA and is shown to generate VMT over the City's established threshold of significance. The City's Resolution states that VMT Mitigation Fee of $150.00 per vehicle mile traveled above the City's VMT impact threshold shall be paid. Through the payment of fees that fund programs that reduce VMT in the City, payment of the fees will result on impacts that are less than significant. The Project would be able to pay the fee per VMT to reduce the project's total VMT to a less than significant level. As calculated above, the Project is required to reduce its VMT impact by 810 total VMT. In order for the Project to reduce its VMT impact to a level of less than significant, the Project will need to contribute a fee of $121,500 (810 x $150 = $121,500). (Urban Crossroads, 2023g, p. 4)

TRN MM-1: The proposed project shall pay the City's Vehicle Miles Traveled Impact Fee prior to the issuance of any construction related permits in accordance with the adopted program and certified Program EIR. The fee is $150.00 per VMT for a total of $121,500.00.

c. **Less than Significant Impact.**

The project site is proposed to be developed with a 217,700 square foot building for light industrial and general warehouse uses, consistent with the LI zoning for the site..

[1] (11.3 VMT/EmployeeProject x 225 Employees) - (7.7 VMT/EmployeeThreshold x 225 Employees) = 810 VMT

[2] 810 VMT / 2,563 VMT x 100 = 32%

No transportation safety hazards would result from implementing the proposed project. As part of the project's design, roadway improvements would be installed to facilitate passenger vehicle and truck access to and from the site. The project would construct Avenue L-4 to accommodate a minimum of one travel lane in each direction from the project's western boundary to the project's eastern boundary consistent with the City's standards in order to facilitate site access. On-site traffic signing and striping would be implemented in accordance with the provisions of the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and in conjunction with detailed construction plans for the Project site. Sight distance at each project access point will be reviewed by the City with respect to standard California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and City of Lancaster sight distance standards at the time permit issuance. (Urban Crossroads, 2023f, p. 7)

A queuing analysis was conducted for the project driveways for Existing plus Ambient Growth plus Project plus Cumulative 2024 (EAPC 2024) traffic conditions to determine the turn pocket lengths necessary to accommodate near-term 95th percentile queues and to verify if any spillback occurs onto the adjacent intersection. The existing storage lengths are anticipated to accommodate the future 95th percentile peak hour queues at the intersection of Sierra Highway and Avenue L-4. Due to the typical wide turning radius of large trucks, a truck turning template was overlaid on the site plan at each applicable project driveway anticipated to be utilized by heavy trucks in order to determine appropriate curb radii and to verify that trucks will have sufficient space to execute turning maneuvers. As shown in the *Traffic Analysis,* project driveway 1 is anticipated to accommodate the wide turning radius of heavy trucks as currently designed. (Urban Crossroads, 2023f, p. 8)

Access to the building would be provided via two gated entrances extending from Avenue L-4. The driveways are designed to allow for full turning movements into and out of the site and all proposed improvements would be implemented in a manner consistent with the LMC. In addition, the driveways would be constructed and maintained with a minimum clearance distance of 50 feet between any fence, building, or other obstacle and the face of curb on the adjacent roadway to permit vehicles to queue entirely off the public right of way after entering the driveway, per the City of Lancaster Engineering Design Guidelines (Section 2.2.10.11.3). The project's proposed improvements have been reviewed by the City and would not increase hazards due to a geometric design feature. No hazardous design conditions associated with the project's design or truck routing would occur and impacts would be less than significant.

Based on the preceding analysis, the Project would not result in increased hazards to transportation as a result of incompatible uses. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d. **Less than Significant Impact**.

During construction of the proposed project, project construction contractors would be required to maintain adequate emergency access routes on site. Additionally, the project's proposed development plans have been reviewed by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department, which has determined that the project's design would provide for adequate access for emergency vehicles under long-term operations. The Fire Apparatus Access Road shall be located between 10 feet and 30 feet from the building and shall be positioned parallel to one entire side of the building. The project would provide a minimum 32-foot centerline turning radius for the Fire Apparatus Access Roads.

XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
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, or cultural landscape that is geographically defines 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	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1? In applying for the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☐	☐	☒

a. <u>No Impact.</u>

No resources were identified on the project site that that would be eligible for the California Register and no prehistoric resource sites were found on the project site based on the cultural records search and pedestrian survey of the project site. Six isolated historic period artifacts are within the project site, however these isolated occurrences appear to be displaced remnants of a previously identified cultural resource site located outside of the project site.

In accordance with AB 52 consultation process required by State law, the City sent notification of the project to three Native American tribes who have requested to be included. These letters were mailed on October 28, 2022, to the following Native American Tribes: 1) Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, 2) Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation and 3) Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians. The Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians responded and no responses from the other tribes were received. While the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians did not identify any tribal cultural resources on the project site, they did request specific mitigation measures regarding worker education and procedures to follow in the event resources are identified. These specific measures have been included in the cultural resources section. As such, no impacts to tribal cultural resources would occur.

XIX. Utilities and Service Systems

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

a. **Less than Significant Impact**.

The proposed project would be required to connect to the existing utilities such as water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, telecommunications facilities, etc. Connection points would occur on the Project site or within existing and proposed roadway of rights-of-way.

b. **Less than Significant Impact.**

The Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40 is the public water purveyor for the project site. According to the Water Supply Assessment (WSA) (*Technical Appendix K*) prepared for the project site by Akel Engineering Group, Inc. in September 2022, the calculated water demand for the project is 11 acre-feet per year (Akel, 2022, p. 3). The LACWD District 40's total project water supplies during normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry water years would meet the projected water demand for the project site through 2045 through a combination of the existing supply, groundwater banking, new supply and recycled water. (Akel, 2022, p. 9) As such, impacts would be less than significant.

c. Less than Significant Impact.

The proposed project would discharge directly to the Districts' Amargosa Creek Trunk Sewer, located in Avenue L-4 at Wall Street upon annexation. According to the letter dated October 26, 2022 from the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles (LACSD), this 15-inch diameter trunk sewer has a design capacity of million 3.2 gallons per day (mgd) and conveyed a peak flow of 0.1 mgd when last measured in 2021. The project's wastewater would be treated at the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant which has a design capacity of 18 mgd and currently processes an average recycled water flow of 13.9 mgd. The expected average wastewater flow from the proposed project is 5,443 gallons per day. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d. **Less than Significant Impact.**

Solid waste collection at the project site would be provided by Waste Management and would be hauled to the Antelope Valley Landfill or the Lancaster Landfill. The Antelope Valley Landfill's maximum permitted throughput is 5,548 tons per day with a remaining capacity of 17,911,225 cubic yards as of October 2017 (CalRecycle, n.d.). The Lancaster Landfill's maximum permitted throughput is 5,100 tons per day with a remaining capacity of 14,514,648 cubic yards as of August 2012 (CalRecycle, n.d.).

Construction Impact Analysis

Solid waste requiring disposal would be generated by the construction process, primarily consisting of discarded materials and packaging. Based on the size of the project and the United States Environmental Protection Agency's (U.S. EPA) construction waste generation factor of 4.34 pounds per square foot for non-residential uses, approximately 472.41 tons of waste is expected to be generated during the project's construction phase ([217,700 SF × 4.34 pounds per SF = 944,818 pounds] ÷ 2,000 pounds per ton = 472.41 tons) (EPA, 2009, p. 10) The project's construction phase is estimated to last approximately 400 days; therefore, the project is estimated to generate approximately 1.18-tons of solid waste per day during its construction (472.41 tons ÷ 400 days =1.18-ton per day) requiring landfill disposal.

The project would be required to comply with California Assembly Bill 939 (AB 939) which requires that a minimum of 50% of all solid waste be diverted from landfills (by recycling, reusing, and other waste reduction strategies). Non-recyclable construction waste generated by the project would be disposed at the Antelope Valley Landfill or the Lancaster Landfill. Either of these landfills could accommodate all construction debris that would be generated by the project, thus, the relatively minimal construction waste generated by the project is not anticipated to cause either landfill to exceed its maximum permitted daily disposal volume. Because both landfills have sufficient daily capacity to accept solid waste generated by the project's construction phase, impacts to landfill capacity associated with the project's near-term construction activities would be less than significant.

Operational Impact Analysis

Based on a daily waste generation factor of 1.42 pounds of waste per 100 square feet of industrial building area obtained from CalRecycle, long-term, on-going operation of the 9roject would generate approximately 1.54 tons of solid waste per day [(1.42 pounds ÷ 100 SF) × 217,700 SF] ÷ 2,000 pounds = 1.54 tons per day) (CalRecycle, n.d.). Pursuant to AB 939, at least 50 percent of the project's solid waste is required to be diverted from landfills; therefore, the project would generate a maximum of 0.77-ton of solid waste per day requiring landfilling (1.54 tons per day × 0.50 = 0.77-ton per day). (CalRecycle, n.d.) Non-recyclable solid waste generated during long-term operation of the project would be disposed at the Antelope Valley Landfill or the Lancaster Landfill. As described above, these landfills receive well below their maximum permitted daily disposal volume; thus, waste generated by the project's operation is not anticipated to cause either landfill to exceed its maximum permitted daily disposal volume. Because the project would generate a relatively small amount of solid waste per day as compared to the

permitted daily capacities at receiving landfills, impacts to regional landfill facilities during the project's long-term operational activities would be less than significant.

e. **Less than Significant Impact**.

The California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939), signed into law in 1989, established an integrated waste management system that focused on source reduction, recycling, composting, and land disposal of waste. In addition, the bill established a 50 percent waste reduction requirement for cities and counties by the year 2000, along with a process to ensure environmentally safe disposal of waste that could not be diverted. The project's building tenant(s) would be required to work with future refuse haulers to develop and implement feasible waste reduction programs, including source reduction, recycling, and composting. Additionally, in accordance with the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991 (PRC § 42911), the project is required to provide adequate areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials where solid waste is collected. The collection areas are required to be shown on construction drawings and be in place before occupancy permits are issued. (CA Legislative Info, n.d.) Additionally, in compliance with AB 341 (Mandatory Commercial Recycling Program), the future occupant(s) of the proposed project would be required to arrange for recycling services, if the occupant generates four or more cubic yards of solid waste per week (CA Legislative Info, n.d.). The implementation of these mandatory requirements would reduce the amount of solid waste generated by the project and diverted to landfills, which in turn will aid in the extension of the life of affected disposal sites. The project would be required to comply with all applicable solid waste statutes and regulations; as such, impacts related to solid waste statutes and regulations would be less than significant.

XX. Wildfire

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zone, would the project:				
a. Substantially impact an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a. **No Impact**.

According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), the project site is not located in or near State Responsibility Areas (SRAs) or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones (VHFHSZ). (CAL FIRE, n.d.) Because the project is not located within an SRA or VHFHSZ, implementation of the project would not substantially impact an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project site does not contain any emergency facilities, nor does it serve as an emergency evacuation route; however, it is located in the immediately vicinity of an evacuation route (Sierra Highway). Additionally, because the project is not located near SRAs or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, the project would not impair emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. Regardless, during construction and long-term operation of the project, adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles would be required to be maintained along public streets that abut the project site. Furthermore, improvements planned as part of the project are not anticipated to adversely affect traffic operations in the local area. As part of the City's discretionary review process, the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) conducted a review of the Project plans to ensure that appropriate emergency ingress and egress would be available to and from the project site and that circulation on the project site was adequate for emergency apparatus. Because the project is not located near SRAs or lands classified as a very high wildfire hazard zone, implementation of the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan. No impact would occur.

b. **No Impact.**

The project is not located within or near an SRA or VHFHSZ. In addition, the project site is not located in a portion of the City that is subject to wildland fire hazards. Due to the lack of wildfire susceptibility in the areas surrounding the project site, the project has no potential to exacerbate wildfire risks in a manner that could expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. Accordingly, no impact would occur.

c. **No Impact.**

The project is not located within or near an SRA or VHFHSZ. In addition, the project site is not located in a portion of the City that is subject to wildland fire hazards. Furthermore, to ensure adequate fire protection for all residents of the City, the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) enforces fire standards as they review building plans, conduct building inspections, and review structures for compliance with the California Fire Code, California PRC §§ 4290-4299, California Government Code § 51178, and the County of Los Angeles Fire Code and Department Regulations. The project involves the construction of one new light industrial building, which would be constructed in compliance with all applicable building and fire codes along with installation of on-site and off-site improvements to provide fire access. Additionally, a fire department access site plan has been developed for the Project which includes the installation of new private fire hydrants around the perimeters of both buildings, as well as 28-foot private driveways to be used as fire lanes around the building. Accordingly, due to the lack of wildfire susceptibility in the areas surrounding the project site, the project has no potential to exacerbate wildfire risks in a manner that could expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. No impact would occur.

d. **No Impact.**

The project is not located within or near an SRA or VHFHSZ. In addition, the project site is not located in a portion of the City that is subject to wildland fire hazards. As such, the project site is not located within a portion of the City of Lancaster that is subject to downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Furthermore, the project would not include any large slopes that could be subject to landslide hazards, and the proposed drainage system for the project is designed to ensure that the project would not be subject to flood hazards. Accordingly, no impact would occur.

XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self- sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a. <u>Less than Significant Impact.</u>

As indicated throughout the analysis in this MND (refer specifically to MND subsections IV, Biological Resources, IX.E, Cultural Resources, and XVIII, Tribal Cultural Resources), assuming incorporation of the mitigation measures identified herein, implementation of the proposed Project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habit of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or 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. Therefore, with mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

b. <u>Less than Significant Impact</u>

Cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the Project have been evaluated throughout this MND, which concludes that such impacts would not occur, would be less than significant, or would be reduced to below a level of significance with the incorporation of mitigation measures identified herein and included in the Project's conditions of approval. Other projects have been approved and/or submitted within approximately one mile of the project site (See Table 19, Cumulative Projects List). These projects are also required to be in accordance with the City's zoning code and General Plan.

Table 19 Cumulative Projects List

Case No.	Location	APNs	Description	Status
CUP 20-04	Forbes St & Enterprise Pkwy	3128-008-025	22,843 sf cannabis cultivation and manufacturing facility	Approved
SPR 22-02	South of Ave L, 600 West of Sierra Hwy	3128-00-034 and 3128-007-039	28,895 sf warehouse facility with loading docks	Approved
SPR 22-03	SWC of Sierra Hwy and Ave L	3128-007-030 and 3128-007-38	93,465 sf mini storage facility with office and caretaker's unit	Approved
DR 21-175	42851 Sierra Hwy	3128-006-042	7,000 sf warehouse	Approved
SPR 19-08	4th St E and Ave L-8	3126-019-025	Truck storage and maintenance building	Under Review
CUP 19-04	Valleyline Rd, North of Ave L-12	3126-019-034	22,000 sf cannabis cultivation and manufacturing facility	Under Review
SPR 22-09	42235 Sierra Hwy	3128-014-010	New commissary facility	Under Review
SPR 22-07	6th St W, South of Ave L-8	3128-020-015	Two industrial buildings totaling 17,000 sf	Under Review
SPR 22-08	NEC Ave L-8 and 12th St W	3109-025-049	20,872 sf warehouse	Under Review
SPR 21-16	Ave L-12 btw 10th St W and 12th St W	3109-024-0430	19,488 sf of industrial buildings	Approved
CUP 21-06	NWC 6th St W & Ave M		Renewable hydrogen fuel production facility	Approved
SPR 22-11	Forbes Street & Market Street	3128-008-009	233,600 sf pf industrial buildings	Approved

c. **Less than Significant Impact**

The Project's potential to result in substantial adverse effects on human beings has been evaluated throughout this MND (e.g., Air Quality, Geology/Soils, Noise, etc.). Where potentially significant impacts are identified, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce these adverse effects to the maximum feasible extent. There are no components of the proposed Project that could result in substantial adverse effects on human beings that are not already evaluated and disclosed throughout this MND. Accordingly, no additional impacts would occur.

References

Documents Appended to this MND

The following reports, studies, and supporting documentation were used in preparing this MND and are bound separately as Technical Appendices. A copy of the Technical Appendices is available for review at the City of Lancaster Community Development Department at 44933 Fern Avenue, Lancaster, California 93534.

Cited As:	**Source:**
(Akel, 2022)	AKEL Engineering Group, Inc., 2022. *Water Supply Assessment for L4 Avenue Warehouse*. Included as ***Technical Appendix K*** to this MND.
(CCG, 2022)	Consolidated Consulting Group, LLC, 2022. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment*. June 2, 2022. Included as ***Technical Appendix G*** to this MND.
(GLA, 2023)	Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc. 2023. *Biological Technical Report for the Avenue L-4 Property Project*. February 10, 2023. Included as ***Technical Appendix B*** to this MND.
(PaleoWest, 2023)	PaleoWest, 2023. *Cultural Resources Assessment for the Lancaster Avenue L-4 Project*. March 10, 2023. Included as ***Technical Appendix C1*** to this MND.
(PaleoWest, 2022)	PaleoWest, 2022. *Paleontological Resource Assessment for the Lancaster Avenue L-4 Project.* October 10, 2022. Included as ***Technical Appendix C2*** to this MND.
(Psomas, 2023a)	Psomas, 2023a. Results of a Focused Survey for Burrowing Owl. August 22, 2023. Included as **Technical Appendix B2** to this MND.
(Psomas, 2023b)	Psomas, 2023b. Results of the Focused Special Status Plant Survey. August 23, 2023. Included as **Technical Appendix B3** to this MND.
(SCG, 2022a)	Southern California Geotechnical, 2022a. *Geotechnical Investigation*. July 7, 2022. Included as ***Technical Appendix E1*** to this MND.
(SCG, 2022b)	Southern California Geotechnical, 2022b. *Results of Infiltration Testing*. July 19, 2022. Included as Technical **Appendix E2** to this MND.
(Sikand, 2022)	Sikand Engineering Associates, 2022. *Hydrology Study*. October 7, 2022. Included as *Technical* ***Appendix H*** to this MND.
(Urban Crossroads, 2023a)	Urban Crossroads, 2023a. *Avenue L4 Warehouse Air Quality Impact Analysis*. March 13, 2023. Included as ***Technical Appendix A1*** to this MND.
(Urban Crossroads, 2023b)	Urban Crossroads, 2023b. *Avenue L4 Warehouse Mobile Source Health Risk Assessment*. March 13, 2023. Included as ***Technical Appendix A2*** to this MND.
(Urban Crossroads, 2023c)	Urban Crossroads, 2023c. *Avenue L4 Warehouse Energy Analysis*. March 13, 2023. Included as ***Technical Appendix D*** to this MND.
(Urban Crossroads, 2023d)	Urban Crossroads, 2023d. *Avenue L4 Warehouse Greenhouse Gas Analysis*. August 16, 2023. Included as ***Technical Appendix F*** to this MND.
(Urban Crossroads, 2023e)	Urban Crossroads, 2023e. *Avenue L4 Warehouse Noise and Vibration Analysis.* December 11, 2023. Included as ***Technical Appendix I*** to this MND.
(Urban Crossroads, 2023f)	Urban Crossroads, 2023f. *Avenue L-4 Warehouse Traffic Analysis*. August 21, 2023. Included as ***Technical Appendix J1*** to this MND.
(Urban Crossroads, 2023g)	Urban Crossroads, 2023g. *L-4 Avenue Warehouse Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT Analysis)*. August 4, 2023. Included as ***Technical Appendix J2*** to this MND.
(Urban Crossroads, 2023h)	Urban Crossroads, 2023h. *L-4 Warehouse Supplemental Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis. April 11, 2023.* Included as ***Technical Appendix J3*** to this MND.

Documents and Websites Consulted in Preparation of this MND

Cited As:	**Source:**
Assurance Learning Academy, n.d.	Assurance Learning Academy, n.d. *Change Your Story*. Accessed January 18, 2023. Available online: https://assurancelearning.org/
CA Legislative Info, n.d.	California Legislative Information, n.d. CHAPTER 18. *California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991 [42900 - 42912].* Accessed January 18, 2023. Available online: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=42911&lawCode=PRC
CA Legislative Info, n.d.	California Legislative Information, n.d. *AB-341 Solid waste: diversion*. Accessed January 18, 2023. Available online: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201120120AB341
CA Legislative Info, 1998	California Legislative Information, n.d. *SB 50*. Accessed January 18, 2023. Available online: http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/97-98/bill/sen/sb_0001-0050/sb_50_bill_19980827_chaptered.html
CalEPA, 2023	California Department of Environmental Protection (CalEPA), 2023. *SB 535 Disadvantaged Communities (2022 Update)*. Accessed: March 1, 2023. Available online: https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/1c21c53da8de48f1b946f3402fbae55c/page/SB-535-Disadvantaged-Communities/
CAL FIRE, n.d.	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, n.d. *State Responsibility Area Viewer*. Accessed March 8, 2023. Available online: https://calfire-forestry.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=468717e399fa4238ad86861638765ce1
CalRecycle, n.d.	California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery, n.d. *SWIS Facility Details - Antelope Valley Public Landfill*. Accessed January 18, 2023. Available online: https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/3458?siteID=1364
CalRecycle, n.d.	California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery, n.d. *SWIS Facility Site Lancaster Landfill*. Accessed January 18, 2023. Available online: https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/3571?siteID=1035
CalRecycle, n.d.	California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery, n.d. *Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates.* Accessed January 18, 2023. Available online: https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates
CalRecycle, n.d	California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery, n.d. *Enforcement*. Accessed March 9, 2023. Available online: https://calrecycle.ca.gov/lgcentral/enforcement/
Caltrans, 2018	California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), 2018. *California State Scenic Highways*. Accessed March 1, 2023. Available online: https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways
CARB, 2022a	California Air Resources Board (CARB), 2022a. *2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality*. November 16, 2022. Accessed April 5, 2023. Available on-line: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-12/2022-sp.pdf
CDC, n.d.	California Department of Conservation, n.d. *California Important Farmland Finder*. Accessed March 8, 2023. Available online: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/
CDFW, n.d.	California Department of Fish and Wildlife, n.d. *Frequently Asked Questions*. Accessed March 8, 2023. Available online: https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/CESA/WJT
City of Lancaster, 2009a	City of Lancaster, 2009a. *General Plan 2030*. July 14, 2009. Accessed January 18, 2023. Available online: https://www.cityoflancasterca.org/our-city/departments-services/development-services/planning/general-plan-2030

Cited As:	**Source:**
City of Lancaster, 2009b	City of Lancaster, 2009b. *General Plan 2030 Master Environmental Assessment*. April 2009. Accessed January 18, 2023. Available online: https://www.cityoflancasterca.org/our-city/departments-services/development-services/planning/general-plan-2030
City of Lancaster, 2022a	City of Lancaster, 2022a. *Lancaster General Plan Safety Element*. February 2022. Accessed January 18, 2023. Available online: https://www.cityoflancasterca.org/our-city/departments-services/development-services/planning/general-plan-2030
City of Lancaster, 2022b	City of Lancaster, 2022b. *Municipal Code*. December 28, 2022. Accessed March 8, 2023. Available online: https://library.municode.com/ca/lancaster/codes/code_of_ordinances
EPA, 2009	United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2009. *Estimating 2003 Building-Related Construction and Demolition Materials Amounts*. March 2009. Accessed January 18, 2023. Available online: https://www.epa.gov/smm/estimating-2003-building-related-construction-and-demolition-materials-amounts
FEMA, 2023	Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2023. *National Flood Hazard Layer FIRMette*. March 9, 2023. Accessed March 9, 2023. Available online: https://msc.fema.gov/portal/home
Google Earth, 2022	Google Earth, 2022. Imagery Date 2022. Accessed March 8, 2023.
Google Maps, 2023	Google Maps, 2023. Imagery Date 2023. Accessed January 18, 2023.
LACWD, 2021	Los Angeles County Waterworks Districts, 2021. *Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40 Map*. 2021. Accessed March 9, 2023. Available online: https://dpw.lacounty.gov/wwd/web/about/Maps.aspx
OEHHA, 2023	California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), 2022. *CalEnviroScreen 4.0. 2022*. Accessed: March 1, 2023. Available online: https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen/report/calenviroscreen-40
USCB, 2010a	United States Census Bureau, 2010a. *Urbanized Areas and Urban Clusters: 2010.* 2010. Accessed December 22, 2022. Available online: https://www2.census.gov/geo/pdfs/maps-data/maps/reference/2010UAUC_List.pdf
USCB, 2010b	United States Census Bureau, 2010b. *2010 Census Urban Area Reference Maps*. 2010. Accessed December 22, 2022. Available online: https://www.census.gov/geographies/reference-maps/2010/geo/2010-census-urban-areas.html