

CITY OF LANCASTER  
INITIAL STUDY (REVISED)

1. Project title and File Number: Tentative Tract Map No. 062664
2. Lead agency name and address: City of Lancaster  
Community Development  
44933 Fern Avenue  
Lancaster, California 93534
3. Contact person and phone number: Jocelyn Swain  
(661) 723-6100
4. Applicants: Rodeo Credit Enterprises, LLC  
(Former Applicant: Gilley Group, LLC)  
Attn: Timothy Roofian  
9595 Wilshire Boulevard, Ste 708  
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
5. Location: 17.9± gross acres located on the southeast corner of 40<sup>th</sup> Street West and future Avenue M-4
6. General Plan designation: NU (Non Urban Residential, 0.4 – 2 dwelling units per acre)
7. Zoning: SRR (Semi-Rural Residential; one single family dwelling unit per 20,000 square foot lot).
8. Description of project: A subdivision for 30 single family lots in the SRR zone.

Subsequent to the City's approval of all discretionary actions by the City of Lancaster Planning Commission on November 21, 2005, the Joshua tree was listed as a candidate species under the California Endangered Species Act and the Western Joshua Tree Conservation Act was signed into law. To streamline the Incidental Take Permit (ITP) process, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife has requested that the City revise the Initial Study to specially address impacts to the Joshua tree from the proposed project and to identify appropriate mitigation measures. This initial study has been revised to address impacts to the Joshua tree onsite and some minor updating of other information such as the applicant. No other changes to the adopted initial study have been made. All new language can be found in Section IV.a on pages 18 through 22 of this document. No new mitigation measures, with the exception of the mitigation measure for the Joshua tree, have been added.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: The subject property is vacant. The site has experienced considerable disturbance due to off road vehicle traffic and refuse disposal. The General Plan designation, zoning, and land use of the surrounding properties are as follows: the properties to the north, south, east, and west are designated as NU (Non Urban Residential), and are zoned SRR. The properties to the north, south, and east are undeveloped. The western properties are partially vacant and partially developed with a single family residence. In addition, the property located on the southwest corner of 40<sup>th</sup> Street West and Avenue M-4, which is not a part of the project site, is developed with a retention basin referred to as the Avenue M-2 Basin.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

_____	Aesthetics	_____	Agriculture Resources	_____	Air Quality
_____	Biological Resources	_____	Cultural Resources	_____	Geology / Soils
_____	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	_____	Hydrology / Water Quality	_____	Land Use / Planning
_____	Mineral Resources	_____	Noise	_____	Population / Housing
_____	Public Services	_____	Recreation	_____	Transportation / Traffic
_____	Utilities / Service Systems	_____	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:

  X   I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

\_\_\_\_\_ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

\_\_\_\_\_ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

\_\_\_\_\_ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in a earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicant 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  
Jocelyn Swain, Senior Planner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date November 1, 2024

#### 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” 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 (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” 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 Used. 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 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 significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. <u>AESTHETICS</u> -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	
II. <u>AGRICULTURE RESOURCES</u> : In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. 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?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?				X
III. <u>AIR QUALITY</u> -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
c) 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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
IV. <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u> -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
V. <u>CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?		X		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	
VI. <u>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</u> -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for disposal of waste water?				X
<b>VII. <u>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</u> -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably fore-seeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X	
VIII. <u>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</u> – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or off-site?			X	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?			X	
f) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
g) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
i) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
IX. <u>LAND USE AND PLANNING</u> -- Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?				X
X. <u>MINERAL RESOURCES</u> -- Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				X
XI. <u>NOISE</u> -- Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XII. <u>POPULATION AND HOUSING</u></b> -- Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
<b>XIII. <u>PUBLIC SERVICES</u></b>				
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?			X	
Police protection?			X	
Schools?			X	
Parks?			X	
Other public facilities?			X	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. <u>RECREATION</u> --				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
XV. <u>TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC</u> -- Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X	
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X
<u>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</u> -- Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X	
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
e) Have a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII. <u>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</u> -</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to 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, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X		
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

I. a. Development of the site will eliminate the current open appearance of the property and eliminate current views across it. All impacts are expected to be less than significant because the site is not adjacent to an identified scenic area as listed by the General Plan (LMEA Figure 12.0-1). The development of the project would block views to the same extent as would typical single family residences in a semi-rural zone.

b. The site contains no existing scenic resources or historic buildings that meet the minimum criteria for significance under CEQA.

c. Development of the site as proposed would change the visual character of the site in that it would result in the development of vacant land with single family residential uses. However, the site is characteristic of a juniper tree woodland plant community and has experienced considerable disturbance



(see biological resource report dated March 2005). Therefore, impacts to the visual character of the site would be less than significant.

d. The light generated from the project in the form of street lights, residential lighting, and motor vehicles would be similar in character and intensity to developed rural residential property; therefore, no significant impact is anticipated.

II. There is evidence that the site was used for agricultural production at some time in the past. The site is not identified as Prime or Unique farmland, contains no Williamson Act contract, and is not located in proximity to any existing agricultural operation. Therefore, the project will not have an impact on agricultural resources.

III. a. Development proposed under the City's General Plan will not create air emissions that exceed the Air Quality Management Plan (GPEIR p. 5.6-1 to 2). Therefore, the project itself will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan.

b. The project will generate approximately 300 additional vehicle trips in the area on a daily basis, which will generate pollutants. However, the amount of traffic generated by the project is not sufficient to create or contribute considerably to violations of air quality standards on either a localized or regional basis (GPEIR p. 5.6-6 to 9). The project contains no significant stationary sources that would contribute to air quality violations. Emissions created during construction will not be significant because they are temporary in nature and quickly dispersed. Creation of fugitive dust will be minimized as noted under Item VI.b.

c. The project would, in conjunction with other development as allowed by the General Plan, result in a cumulative net increase of pollutants. However, the project's contribution is considered as de minimus because of its small scale.

d. Paraclete High School and Valley View Elementary is located approximately one and a quarter mile southeast of the subject property (LMEA p. 7.0-13 to 16 and Figure 7.0-2). Therefore, with prevailing southwest winds, the impact of short-term emissions generated by the operation of construction equipment and machinery on these sensitive receptors would be a less than significant.

e. The project could create odors on a temporary basis in conjunction with the operation of construction equipment and machinery. This effect is not considered to be significant because the prevailing southwest wind would rapidly disperse them.

IV. a. Mark Hagan conducted a biological survey on the property during March 2005 that indicates this project is not expected to result in a significant adverse impact to biological resources. According to the study, specific focus was given to the presence/absence of rare, threatened and endangered species of plants and wildlife known to occur in this region. No desert tortoises and burrowing owls, or signs thereof, were observed on the property or in the surrounding area. The project site is not located within the geographic range of the Mohave ground squirrel. In addition, no other state or federally listed species are expected to occur within the proposed project area. However, the study area provides potentially suitable habitat for burrowing owls. Therefore, a burrowing owls survey should be conducted thirty days prior to ground disturbing (grading/vegetation removal) activities. If evidence of burrowing owls is discovered during the survey, construction activities shall be halted and the State Department of Fish and Game shall be consulted regarding the necessary management/mitigation requirements for

these species. With mitigation measures added to the project, impacts would be reduced to less than significant (see biological resource report March 2005).

The City of Lancaster issued all their discretionary approvals for this project in 2005. Subsequent to the adoption of this Initial Study and approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 62664, the Joshua tree was listed as a candidate species under the California Endangered Species Act in September 2020. The Western Joshua Tree Conservation Act was signed into law in September 2023. In order for the applicant to obtain a permit for the removal of Joshua trees from the project site, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) has requested that the City amend the adopted initial study to discuss impacts to Joshua trees. The following addresses impacts to Joshua trees from implementation of the proposed project based on information contained in an updated biological report and a Joshua tree census prepared in support of the Incidental Take Permit Application. The updated biological report was prepared by Mark Hagan and documented in a report entitled “Biological Resource Assessment of APNs 3111-001-047 and 093, Lancaster, California” and dated September 30, 2024. Aspen Environmental Group prepared a Joshua tree census entitled “Western Joshua Tree Inventory Results” and dated June 19, 2024. The following summarizes the results of both reports.

The updated biological survey was conducted on September 26, 2024 by walking east-west pedestrian transects across the site. A total of 12 transects were conducted spaced approximately 50 feet apart. The project site is characteristic of highly impacted Joshua tree and California juniper woodland and desert scrub plant communities. A total of 27 plant species and 25 wildlife species, or their sign, were observed on the site and are listed in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. No alkali mariposa lilies, desert cymopterus or Barstow woolly sunflowers were observed on site and no suitable habitat is present. Suitable habitat for desert tortoise or Mohave ground squirrels is not present on site. No Swainson’s hawks were observed on site or no nests have been observed within 5 miles of the project site. No burrowing owls were observed on site; however, California ground squirrel burrows are present which could be occupied by burrowing owls prior to the start of construction. Mitigation measures were already included for burrowing owls and nesting birds and no revisions are necessary.

**Table 1**  
**Plant Species**

Joshua tree ( <i>Yucca brevifolia</i> )	Peachthorn ( <i>Lycium cooperi</i> )	Winterfat ( <i>Eurotia lanata</i> )
Mormon tea ( <i>Ephedra nevadensis</i> )	California juniper ( <i>Juniperus californica</i> )	Four-wing saltbush ( <i>Atriplex canescens</i> )
Rabbit brush ( <i>Chrysothamnus nauseosus</i> )	Desert straw ( <i>Stephanomeria pauciflora</i> )	Flat-top buckwheat ( <i>Eriogonum deflexum</i> )
Angle-stem buckwheat ( <i>Eriogonum angulosum</i> )	Spotted buckwheat ( <i>Eriogonum maculatum</i> )	Turkey mullein ( <i>Eremocarpus setigerus</i> )
Vinegar weed ( <i>Trichostema lanceolatum</i> )	Autumn vinegar-weed ( <i>Lessingia germanorum</i> )	Goldfields ( <i>Lasthenia californica</i> )
Blue mantle ( <i>Eriastrum diffusum</i> )	Fiddleneck ( <i>Amsinckia tessellata</i> )	Rattlesnake weed ( <i>Euphorbia albomarginata</i> )
Prickly lettuce ( <i>Lactuca seriola</i> )	Russian thistle ( <i>Salsola iberica</i> )	Cheatgrass ( <i>Bromus tectorum</i> )
Tumble mustard ( <i>Sisymbrium altissimum</i> )	Sahara mustard ( <i>Brassica tournefortii</i> )	Annual burweed ( <i>Franseria acanthicarpa</i> )
Red stemmed filaree ( <i>Erodium cicutarium</i> )	Red brome ( <i>Bromus rubens</i> )	Schismus ( <i>Schismus</i> sp.)

**Table 2  
Wildlife Species**

Rodents (Order: Rodentia)	Kangaroo rat ( <i>Dipodomys</i> sp.)	Prairie falcon ( <i>Falco mexicanus</i> )
Desert cottontail ( <i>Sylvilagus auduboni</i> )	Black-tailed jackrabbit ( <i>Lepus californicus</i> )	California ground squirrel ( <i>Citellus beecheyi</i> )
Coyote ( <i>Canis latrans</i> )	Domestic dog ( <i>Canis familiaris</i> )	Horse ( <i>Equus</i> sp.)
Desert spiny lizard ( <i>Sceloporus magister</i> )	Side blotched lizard ( <i>Uta stansburiana</i> )	Pocket gopher ( <i>Thomomys bottae</i> )
California quail ( <i>Callipepla californica</i> )	Mourning dove ( <i>Zenaida macroura</i> )	Northern mockingbird ( <i>Mimus polyglottos</i> )
Darkling beetle ( <i>Coelocnemis californicus</i> )	White crowned sparrow ( <i>Zonotrichia leucophrys</i> )	House finch ( <i>Carpodacus mexicanus</i> )
Ants, small, black (Order: Hymenoptera)	Fly (Order: Diptera)	Harvester ants (Order: Hymenoptera)
Say’s phoebe ( <i>Sayornis saya</i> )	Common raven ( <i>Corvus corax</i> )	Dragonfly (Order: Odonata)
Spider (Order: Araneida)		

On December 14, 2023, a western Joshua tree census was conducted on the project site. Data was collected for all Joshua trees encountered on the project site including a photo, GPS location, size class, life status (i.e., live or dead), maturity, reproductive status, and any other relevant information. Additional photographs were taken on January 25, 2024. A total of 103 trees were identified on site including 25 Joshua trees less than one meter, 52 Joshua trees between 1 meter and 5 meters, and 26 Joshua trees greater than 5 meters. Information regarding each of the trees is shown in Table 3.

**Table 3  
Joshua Tree Information**

Tree ID	Latitude	Longitude	Size Class	Height (m)	Live or Dead	Branched	Flowering/ Fruiting
1	34.6400356795	-118.1986479550	B	4	Live	Y	None
2A	34.6402808558	-118.1980700640	A	<1	Live	N	None
2B	34.6402808558	-118.1980700640	A	<1	Live	N	None
2C	34.6402808558	-118.1980700640	B	3	Live	Y	None
2D	34.6402808558	-118.1980700640	A	<1	Live	N	None
3A	34.6401627543	-118.1983365250	A	<1	Live	N	None
3B	34.6401627543	-118.1983365250	B	2	Live	Y	None
3C	34.6401627543	-118.1983365250	A	<1	Live	N	None
4A	34.6403610970	-118.1998052740	B	2	Live	N	None
4B	34.6403610970	-118.1998052740	C	6	Live	Y	None
4C	34.6403610970	-118.1998052740	C	6	Live	Y	None
4D	34.640310970	-118.1998052740	B	3	Live	Y	None
4E	34.6403610970	-118.1998052740	A	<1	Live	N	None
4F	34.6403610970	-118.1998052740	A	<1	Live	N	None
4G	34.6403610970	-118.1998052740	C	6	Live	Y	None
4H	34.6403610970	-118.1998052740	C	6	Live	Y	None
4I	34.6403610970	-118.1998052740	A	<1	Live	N	None
5A	34.6402173857	-118.2000729710	B	4	Live	Y	None
5B	34.6402173857	-118.2000729710	B	4	Live	Y	None

6	34.6403590565	-118.2000253810	C	5	Live	Y	None
7	34.6404587332	-118.1996717360	C	6	Live	Y	None
8	34.6404795425	-118.1997231000	B	3	Live	Y	None
9A	34.6405473525	-118.1997450270	A	<1	Live	N	None
9B	34.6405473525	-118.1997450270	C	5	Live	Y	None
10	34.6407761168	-118.1992169550	C	5	Live	Y	None
11	34.6411436798	-118.1985915940	B	3	Live	Y	None
12	34.6411417123	-118.1986748560	B	4	Live	Y	None
13	34.6410469898	-118.1991621670	B	3	Live	Y	None
14A	34.6409552828	-118.1992553580	B	3	Live	Y	None
14B	34.6409552828	-118.1992553580	C	5	Live	Y	None
15	34.6410567452	-118.1993083070	C	5	Live	Y	None
16A	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	A	<1	Live	N	None
16B	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	A	<1	Live	N	None
16C	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	C	5	Live	Y	None
16D	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	C	5	Live	Y	None
16E	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	B	4	Live	Y	None
16F	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	B	4	Live	Y	None
16G	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	B	4	Live	Y	None
16H	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	C	5	Live	Y	None
16I	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	B	4	Live	Y	None
16J	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	A	<1	Live	N	None
16K	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	B	1	Live	Y	None
16L	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	A	<1	Live	N	None
16M	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	B	2	Live	Y	None
16N	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	B	4	Live	Y	None
16O	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	A	<1	Live	N	None
16P	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	C	5	Live	Y	None
16Q	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	A	<1	Live	N	None
16R	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	B	3	Live	Y	None
16S	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	C	5	Live	Y	None
16T	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	A	<1	Live	N	None
16U	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	A	<1	Live	N	None
16V	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	B	4	Live	Y	None
16W	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	B	4	Live	Y	None
16X	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	B	3	Live	Y	None
16Y	34.6409551820	-118.1996648300	A	<1	Live	Y	None
17A	34.6407480768	-118.1999721840	C	5	Live	Y	None
17B	34.6407480768	-118.1999721840	C	6	Live	Y	None
17C	34.6407480768	-118.1999721840	C	5	Live	Y	None
17D	34.6407480768	-118.1999721840	C	6	Live	Y	None
17E	34.6407480768	-118.1999721840	B	3	Live	Y	None
17F	34.6407480768	-118.1999721840	A	<1	Live	N	None
17G	34.6407480768	-118.1999721840	B	3	Live	Y	None
17H	34.6407480768	-118.1999721840	B	3	Live	Y	None
18A	34.6406637628	-118.2001532440	C	6	Live	Y	None
18B	34.6406637628	-118.2001532440	C	7	Live	Y	None
18C	34.6406637628	-118.2001532440	C	7	Live	Y	None
18D	34.6406637628	-118.2001532440	B	3	Live	Y	None
18E	34.6406637628	-118.2001532440	B	4	Live	Y	None
19A	34.6405777417	-118.2001613350	A	<1	Live	N	None

19B	34.6405777417	-118.2001613350	A	<1	Live	N	None
19C	34.6405777417	-118.2001613350	B	4	Live	Y	None
19D	34.6405777417	-118.2001613350	B	4	Live	Y	None
20A	34.6406630090	-118.2004547600	A	<1	Live	N	None
20B	34.6406630090	-118.2004547600	B	4	Live	Y	None
20C	34.6406630090	-118.2004547600	B	1	Live	N	None
20D	34.6406630090	-118.2004547600	B	2	Live	Y	None
20E	34.6406630090	-118.2004547600	A	<1	Live	N	None
20F	34.6406630090	-118.2004547600	B	3	Live	Y	None
20G	34.6406630090	-118.2004547600	C	5	Live	Y	None
20H	34.6406630090	-118.2004547600	B	1	Live	N	None
20I	34.6406630090	-118.2004547600	B	2	Live	Y	None
21	34.6411165842	-118.2000663790	B	3	Live	Y	None
22	34.6412122787	-118.1995770110	B	2	Live	Y	None
23	34.6413045610	-118.1986754560	B	3	Live	Y	None
24	34.6414673192	-118.1971611120	B	4	Live	Y	None
25	34.6413861128	-118.1995280620	B	3	Live	Y	None
26	34.6414324983	-118.1996237450	B	2	Live	Y	None
27A	34.6412270493	-118.1998968590	B	2	Live	Y	None
27B	34.6412270493	-118.1998968590	B	3	Live	Y	None
28A	34.6412314000	-118.2002943250	B	4	Live	Y	None
28B	31.6412314000	-118.2002943250	B	4	Live	Y	None
29	34.6416040493	-118.1998966310	B	3	Live	N	None
30A	34.6419329728	-118.2000178950	A	<1	Live	N	None
30B	34.6419329728	-118.2000178950	A	<1	Live	Y	None
30C	34.6419329728	-118.2000178950	C	5	Live	Y	None
30D	34.6419329728	-118.2000178950	C	5	Live	Y	None
31	34.6418795005	-118.2000711180	C	5	Live	Y	None
32	34.6418990823	-118.1999511110	B	4	Live	Y	None
33A	34.6417058733	-118.1998396170	B	1	Live	N	None
33B	34.6417058733	-118.1998396170	B	2	Live	N	None
33C	34.6417058733	-118.1998396170	B	2	Live	N	None
33D	34.6417058733	-118.1998396170	B	1	Live	N	None

The applicant is constructing a 30-lot single family residential subdivision. Clearing and grading activities related to construction of the subdivision would result in direct impacts to the 103 Joshua trees on the site. All Joshua trees will need to be removed in order for the construction activities to occur. This will result in direct impacts to a State threatened candidate species through the removal of the trees. Indirect impacts could also occur due to increased fugitive dust during construction.

Therefore, the proposed development activities would result in the “Take” of 103 Western Joshua trees when removed from the site. The overall impacts of the project to the local, regional, and State population levels of the Western Joshua tree are expected to be minimal. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to jeopardize the continued existence of the species. However, in order to remove the trees from the project site, the applicant shall obtain a permit in accordance with the Joshua Tree Conservation Act signed into law in July 2023. This required is identified in the mitigation measure below. With implementation of the mitigation, impacts to Joshua trees would be less than significant.

1. The project applicant shall obtain a Western Joshua Tree Conservation Act permit from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to remove the 103 Joshua trees from the project

site. As part of obtaining the Western Joshua Tree Conservation Act permit, the project applicant shall follow all measures outlined in the executed permit and pay all mitigation fees identified under the Western Joshua Tree Conservation Act.

b. The site contains no identified watercourse riparian habitat (BRR).

c. There are no identified wetlands or watercourse on the site that fall under the provisions of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (BRR).

d. The site is not identified as a migratory wildlife corridor or nursery area (BRR).

e. The site is not within an area designated as prime desert woodland according to the adopted General Plan Map; therefore, there are no City-imposed preservation requirements.

f. There are no federal, state, or local habitat conservation plans applicable to the site (BRR).

V. A Phase I and II Cultural Resources investigation was conducted by RTFactfinders on the property during February 2005 (Job No. 388) and June 2005 (Job No. 392). As a result of the investigation, it was determined that the portion of Site 388-1 on the subject property lacks any characteristic that indicates that it is significant under CEQA guidelines; however, the current project area has the potential to expose undiscovered features or deposits. Therefore, there should be no staging of equipment east of the eastern property boundary and no grading or other ground disturbance should occur east of the eastern property boundary. In the event unanticipated cultural materials or features are encountered, even where potential occurrence was not previously recognized, work must stop at the discovery site. A professional cultural resource consultant will need to evaluate the new find. Since no significant prehistoric or historic period resources were identified within the parcels, no direct impacts to cultural resources are anticipated when development occurs if the above stated measures are implemented. With these mitigation measures added to the project, any potential impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant (see cultural resource report).

VI. a. The site is not identified as being in or in proximity to a fault rupture zone (LMEA Figure 2.0-7) and is not subject to liquefaction (SSHZ maps). The site is within Seismic Zone 1 and is, therefore, subject to severe seismic shaking; however, the project will be constructed in accordance with the seismic requirements of the Uniform Building Code (UBC) as adopted by the City, which would render any potential impacts to less than significant. The site is generally level and is not subject to landslides (SSHZ Map).

b. The site is rated as having a moderate risk for soil erosion (USDA SCS maps) when cultivated or cleaned of vegetation. However, there remains a potential for water and wind erosion during construction. The project will be required, under the provisions of Lancaster Municipal Code (LMC) Chapter 8.16, to adequately wet or seal the soil to prevent wind erosion. Water erosion controls must be provided as part of the project grading plan to be reviewed and approved by the City's Engineering Division. These provisions, which are a part of the project, will reduce any impacts to less than significant.

c. The site is not known to be within an area subject to fissuring, sinkholes (LMEA Section 2.0) or liquefaction (SSHZ Map).

d. The soil on the site is characterized by a low shrink-swell potential (LMEA p. 2.0-13 and Figure 2.0-5). A geotechnical report on the properties of soils within the subdivisions shall be submitted to the City by the project developer prior to grading of the property and recommendations of the report shall be incorporated into development of the property. Therefore, any impact would be less than significant.

e. Sewer is available within the area and can be extended to serve the site. The services of the L.A. County Sanitation District 14 (LACSD) will be utilized by the project (ref. Item XVI.b and letter from LACSD letter in file). The use of septic tanks or other alternative waste water disposal systems will not be incorporated into the development.

VII. a-f. An Environmental Site Assessment Report was prepared during February 2005 by Earth Systems. The findings of this investigation the subject property is not listed as having sustained a reported release of hazardous materials. No chemicals or hazardous materials were observed on the property at the time of the site reconnaissance. No evidence of current or historic underground or aboveground storage tanks was identified on the subject property. No oil wells are located in or in the vicinity of the subject property. No potential off-site sources of contamination were identified within a one-mile radius of the subject property. Based on these findings, further environmental investigation is not recommended (ESA). The project is not adjacent to a hazardous waste transportation corridor. The site is more than six miles from Fox Field Airport and more than four miles from Air Force Plant 42 airfield. The development would consist of 30 single family residences and does not include commercial or industrial operations that would be more likely to store and use hazardous products. Typical on-site project use would consist of typical household cleaners, fertilizers, and possible small amounts of pesticides within the landscape area or around buildings. These materials and their use would be similar to that of residential areas. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

g. The project would not impair or physically block any identified evacuation routes (LMEA Figure 9.1-3).

h. The site could be subject to localized brush fires because adjacent land to the north, south, east, and west is primarily undeveloped. However, the site is within two miles of Los Angeles County Fire Station No. 84, which would be able to provide rapid response in the event of a fire. Impacts are, therefore, less than significant.

VIII. a. The site is not in proximity to an open body of water or watercourse and is not in an aquifer recharge area (LMEA p. 10.1-5 to 7); therefore, there will be no discharge into a water body or the aquifer as a result of surface runoff from the project. The project will be connected to the public sewer system.

b. Quartz Hill Water District has not indicated any problems in providing water service to the project (see QHWD letter in the case file). The project is not of a size or scale that would result in a significant increase in the use of groundwater supplies, therefore, impacts to groundwater resources would be less than significant.

c.&d. Development of the site will increase the amount of surface runoff as a result of impervious surfaces (building and pavement) being constructed. The project would be designed, on the basis of a hydrology study, to accept current flows entering the property, to handle the additional incremental runoff from the developed site. In addition, the project is being conditioned to contribute to

the construction of the Avenue M-2 Basin Pump Station. Therefore, impacts from drainage and runoff will be less than significant.

e. The development of the site will result in an incremental increase in storm water runoff. The City Engineer has indicated that the design of the project will utilize the proposed public streets and drainage facilities as the primary means of transporting runoff, and this infrastructure will be designed through a hydrology study to accommodate the expected flows; therefore, impacts from runoff would be less than significant.

f.&g. The site is not within the 100- year flood zone as identified on the FIRM.

h. The project does not contain and is not downstream from a dam or levee.

i. The site is not located in an area subject to mudflows.

IX. a. The project would not block a public street, trail, or other access or result in a physical barrier that would divide the community.

b. The project would not conflict with the City's General Plan and must be in conformance with the Lancaster Municipal Code. As noted previously, the project will be in compliance with the City-adopted UBC (Item VI.a.) and erosion-control requirements (Item VI.b.); no impact is anticipated.

c. As noted under item IV.f., the site does not contain significant natural habitat. No state or federally listed animal species were found on the site and is not subject to a conservation plan (BRR); no impact is anticipated.

X. a&b. The site does not contain any current mining or recovery operations for mineral resources. The site contains potential but presently unproven resources (LMEA p. 2.0-39).

XI. a. The City's General Plan (Table III-1) establishes an outdoor maximum CNEL of 65 dBA for residential areas. The primary source of noise on the site would be from vehicle traffic on 40<sup>th</sup> Street West and future Avenue M-4. The current noise level from streets in the vicinity of the site is under 65 dBA (LMEA Table 8.0-9). This noise level is consistent with the standards of the General Plan and potential impacts from additional traffic from project development would be considered less than significant.

b. The project will not contain groundmounted industrial-type machinery or uses capable of generating groundborne vibrations or noise.

c. Permanent increases in area levels will occur once the residential project is completed and occupied. These noise levels will be generated by normal activities that occur in a residential setting (yard work, radio, television sets, etc.) and from motor vehicles (see discussion under XI.a.). Although the traffic generated by the project will contribute to an increase in noise levels in the area, this impact is consistent with the GPEIR and the project's contribution is considered to be de minimus because the current and future projected noise levels would remain essentially unchanged with or without the project.



d. There will be a temporary increase in noise levels in the area during construction of the project. This noise will be generated by construction vehicles and equipment. Construction activities of the project are regulated by Section 8.24.040 of the Lancaster Municipal Code, which limits the hours of construction work to between sunrise and 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. Effects are not considered significant because they are temporary and construction times limited to daylight hours.

e.&f. The site is not in proximity to an airport or a frequent overflight area and would not experience excessive noise from these sources (also see Item VII a.-f.).

XII. a. The project will generate additional population growth in the immediate area because 30 new dwelling units will be constructed. This additional increase will contribute, on an incremental basis, to a significant cumulative increase in the population of the City over the projected 20 year period of the General Plan. The project site is within the urban core of the City and within the service area of both the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and Station 84 of the Los Angeles County Fire Department. Therefore, the project will not result in a need for additional facilities to provide these services and impacts from increased population growth would be less than significant.

b & c. Development of the project will not displace existing housing or people because the site is currently vacant.

XIII. The project would incrementally increase the need for fire and police services; however, the site is within the current service area of both these agencies and the additional time and cost to service the site is minimal. The project will not induce substantial population growth (see Item XII) and, therefore, will not substantially increase demand on parks or other public facilities.

Development of the project will result in an incremental increase in population (see item XII), which will result in an increase in the number of students in both the Antelope Valley Union High School District and the Westside Union School District. Proposition 1A, which governs the way in which school funding is carried out, predetermines by statute that payment of developer fees are adequate mitigation for school impacts. Therefore, the Initial Study determines by statute that the fees required of the developer would reduce any identified impacts to a level of insignificance.

XIV. a.&b. The project will generate additional population growth and will contribute on an incremental basis to the use of the existing park and recreational facilities. However, the applicant would be required to pay park fees for future parks which would reduce potential impacts on park and recreational facilities to a level of insignificance. At this time, this project will not cause additional facilities to be constructed.

XV. a. The proposed project could generate 300 daily vehicle trips when developed based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual. The City Traffic Engineering Consultant has indicated that the project traffic will not adversely affect traffic flow on any of the adjoining public streets, and that improvements to be provided as part of the project would ensure necessary, adequate circulation and safety levels for both project-related traffic and long-term cumulative increases. Such improvements as a condition of project approval and construction would render potential impacts to a less than significant level.

b. There are no such designated roads in the vicinity of the project.

c. No impacts are anticipated; See Item VII.c.-f.

d. 40<sup>th</sup> Street West and Avenue M-4 will be improved to City standards adjacent to the site as part of the project. No hazardous conditions would be created by these improvements and, therefore, no impact is anticipated.

e. The project will have adequate emergency access from Avenue M-4 via 40<sup>th</sup> Street West. Interior circulation will be provided in accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles County Fire Department; therefore, no impact is anticipated.

f. The project will be required to provide for adequate off-street parking for each dwelling unit in the subdivision per the provisions of the Municipal Code.

g. The project includes the improvements of 40<sup>th</sup> Street West and Avenue M-4, and internal streets within the subdivisions, to City standards, which provides sufficient right-of-way. Pedestrian access from these streets will be provided as part of the project. The project does not conflict with or impede any of the General Plan policies or specific actions related to alternative modes of transportation (LGP p. V-20 to 25).

XVI. a. The project will connect to the local sewer system, and the project sewage will be treated by the Los Angeles County Sanitation District's treatment facilities which has indicated no problem in serving the project (see LACSD response letter in case file). Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

b. Sewer exists in the vicinity of the site capable of serving the property. Wastewater generated by the proposed project will be treated at the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant and no expansion of the treatment facility is needed to accommodate this project (see LACSD letter in case file). Quartz Hill Water District has not indicated any problems in supplying water to the project from existing facilities (see QHWD letter in case file).

c. Less than significant impacts are anticipated; Ref. Item VIII.c. & d.

d.& e. Less than significant impacts are anticipated; Ref. Item VIII a – e, and Item XVI.b.

f. The project will generate additional solid waste, which will contribute to an overall cumulative impact on the landfill serving the site (GPEIR P; 5.9.4-3 to 9), although this project's individual contribution is considered as de minimis. Long term expansion of the landfill would adequately mitigate these cumulative impacts (GPEIR p. 5.9.4-9). Individual residential units within the project will be required to have trash collection services in accordance with City contracts with waste haulers over the life of the project. These haulers are required to be in compliance with applicable regulations on solid waste transport and disposal, including waste stream reduction mandated under AB939.

g. No impacts are anticipated; Ref XVI (f).

XVII. a. Ref. Items I, III, IV, V, VII, XI, XVI.

b. The project's contributions to identify significant cumulative effects are all de minimus. Ref. Items III, XI, XV.

- c. Ref. Items III, VI, VII, VIII, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI.

List of Referenced Documents and Available Locations\*:

BRR1:	Biological Resource Report, Mark Hagan March 2005	CD
BRR2:	Biological Resources Assessment of APNs 3111-001-047 and 093, Lancaster, California, Mark Hagan September 30, 2024	CD
BRR3:	Western Joshua Tree Inventory Results, Aspen Environmental Group, June 19, 2024	CD
CRS:	Cultural Resource Study, RTFactfinders February And June 2005	CD
ESA:	Environmental Site Assessment (Phase 1), Earth Systems February 2005	CD
FIRM:	Flood Insurance Rate Map	PW
GPEIR:	Lancaster General Plan Environmental Impact Report	CD
LACSD:	Los Angeles County Sanitation District Letter, May 2005	CD
LGP:	Lancaster General Plan	CD
LMC:	Lancaster Municipal Code	CD
LMEA:	Lancaster Master Environmental Assessment	CD
QHWD:	Quartz Hill Water District Letter, May 2005	
SSHZ Map:	State Seismic Hazard Zone Maps	CD
UBC:	Uniform Building Code	PW
USDA SCS:	United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Maps	CD

- \* CD: Department of Community Development  
PW: Department of Public Works  
Lancaster City Hall  
44933 Fern Avenue  
Lancaster, California 93534