



COMMUNITY  
DEVELOPMENT

## City of Lancaster Revised Initial Study

1. **Project title and File Number:** Tentative Tract Map No. 66842 Amended
2. **Lead agency name and address:** City of Lancaster  
Development Services Department  
Community Development Division  
44933 Fern Avenue  
Lancaster, California 93534
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Jocelyn Swain, Senior Planner  
City of Lancaster  
Development Services Department  
(661) 723-6100
4. **Location:** 22± gross acres located at the southeast corner of 40<sup>th</sup> Street West and Avenue J-8 (APNs: 3153-046-065, 3153-021-032, -033, -034, -035, -036, -038) (see Figure 1)
5. **Applicant name and address:** Maison's Range 199  
Attn: Kevin Harbison  
211 Village Commons, Suite 11  
Camarillo, CA 93012
6. **General Plan designation:** Urban Residential (UR)
7. **Zoning:** R-7,000 (single family residential, minimum lot size 7,000)
8. **Description of project:**

Tentative Tract Map No. 66842 was submitted to the City on March 17, 2016 for the subdivision of approximately 22 acres into 84 single family residential lots. This subdivision was approved by the City of Lancaster Planning Commission on December 18, 2017. With approval of the subdivision, all discretionary actions for the City were completed and remain valid; no other discretionary approvals are necessary.

The layout of the subdivision is not changing and will still result in the creation of 84 single family residential lots with a minimum lot size of 7,000 square feet. However, in accordance with what is allowable under State law, the developer will be constructing a total of 199 units on

the 84 lots. These dwelling units will consist of the primary residence on each lot along with an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) and Junior Accessory Dwelling Unit (JADU). Within each lot, primary homes, ADUs and JADUs will be separated by a six foot vinyl fence and linked together via a network of walking paths and trails. The perimeter of the subdivision will be enclosed by a six foot block wall. The development will also provide community amenities including a community building (lounge, office spaces, fitness center), park (pool/spa, bbq area), and parking area for the community amenities. The inclusion of ADUs and JADUs on each lot are allowed by right and do not require a discretionary approval.

Subsequent to the approval of the subdivision, the California Fish and Game Commission listed the Joshua tree as a candidate species under the California Endangered Species Act. While in its candidacy period, Joshua trees are afforded the same protections they would receive as a listed species. Joshua trees were identified in the original Initial Study; however, potential impacts to Joshua trees were not analyzed to the level necessary for the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to issue an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) as it was not a candidate/listed species in 2017.

To streamline the ITP process, the City of Lancaster has agreed to revise the Initial Study to specifically address impacts to the Joshua tree from the proposed project and identify adequate mitigation measures. The initial study has been revised to address these impacts and to update the format to the latest version found in the CEQA Guidelines. No new mitigation measures, with the exception of those necessary for the Joshua tree, have been added nor have any substantive revisions to the original mitigation measures been made.

**9. Surrounding land uses and setting:**

The project site is vacant. Most of the properties around the site are developed with single-family homes in the R-7,000 zone. There are large, vacant parcels to the southwest of the site, and a large vacant parcel adjacent to the east. There is a parcel designated P (Public Use, School) to the northeast, containing an elementary school (West Wind Elementary). The other properties surrounding the site are designated as UR by the General Plan. While some of these properties to the north and south on the west end of the site are zoned R-10,000 (single family residential on 10,000 square foot lots), the majority are R-7,000. Table 1 provides the zoning and land uses immediately surrounding the project site.

**Table 1  
 Zoning/Land Use Information**

Direction	Zoning		Land Use
	City	County	
North	R-7,000, R-10,000	N/A	Residential subdivisions
East	R-7,000	N/A	Residential subdivisions, vacant
South	R-7,000	N/A	Residential subdivisions, vacant
West	R-7,000	N/A	Residential subdivisions

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:

- Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40 (connection to the water system)
- Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD)
- Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 14 (connection to public sewer)
- Los Angeles County Fire Department (fire access and life safety equipment)
- Southern California Gas Company (connection to gas line)
- Southern California Edison
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Joshua trees)

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, the City sent letters to a total of three tribes (those that requested notification) via certified, return receipt mail on June 28, 2016. These letters included copies of the site plan, an aerial photograph, and cultural resources report for the project site along with the offer to consult on the project. Table 2 identifies the tribes, the person to whose attention the letter was directed and the date the letter was received. On July 26, 2016, the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians responded that a Native American monitor was necessary and that this particular tribe should be identified as the one required to perform the services. The City agrees that an archaeological monitor should be utilized; however, they do not believe that a Native American monitor from this particular tribe is necessary. Mitigation measures to address archaeological monitoring of the site have been included under the cultural resources discussion.

**Table 2  
 Tribal Notification**

<b>Tribe</b>	<b>Person/Title</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians	Caitlin B. Gulley/Tribal Historic and Cultural Preservation Officer	June 29, 2016
Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation	Andrew Salas/ Chairman	June 29, 2016
San Manuel Band of Mission Indians	Daniel McCarthy/Director of Cultural Resources	June 30, 2016

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

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

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

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

  
 Jocelyn Swain, Senior Planner

3/31/22  
 Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

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

- a. There are no scenic vistas identified in the General Plan readily visible from the project site (LMEA p. 12-1 to 12-3 and Figure 12-1). Views of open desert and mountains surrounding the valley are available from the project site; however, these views would remain available from the roadways and areas surrounding the project site. Therefore, no impacts to scenic vistas would occur as a result of the proposed project.
- b. The project site is not located along any designated State Scenic Highways. There are no historic buildings or rock outcroppings on the project site. There are Joshua trees and California Junipers located on the eastern portion of the site. However, these resources are not located along a State Scenic Highway and removal would result in a less than significant impact.
- c. Development of the proposed project would change the visual character of the project site from undeveloped property to a residential subdivision of 84 lots with 199 residential units. This would change the character of the existing site; however, it would be consistent with the other residential uses in the area. The new development would be landscaped and conform to design standards for structures and public spaces, and will be compatible with surrounding development. The proposed project is also in conformance with the City's General Plan and zoning requirements for the area. Therefore, it has been determined that impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.

- d. Currently no light is generated on the project site. However, the ambient light in the vicinity of the project site is moderate due to other residential developments, vehicle headlights and street lights. Light generated from the project site after development would be in the form of residential lighting, street lighting and light from motor vehicles. The houses on the project site would be constructed from non-reflective materials to the extent feasible. Therefore, impacts with respect to light and glare would be less than significant.

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

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

The Los Angeles County Farmland Map was updated in 2018. On the 2018 map, the project site is designated as Other Land. Other Land is defined as “land not include in any other mapping category; common examples include low density rural developments, brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing, confined livestock, poultry, or aquaculture facilities, strip mines, borrow pits, and water bodies smaller than 40 acres.” The project site and surrounding parcels are designated Urban Residential, which does not allow for agricultural uses. There are no agricultural operations in the immediate vicinity of the project site and no Williamson Act contracts attached to the project site or nearby land. As the project site is not designated as farmland of importance by the State nor is it currently utilized for agricultural purposes, no impacts to agricultural resources would occur.

- c-d. According to the City of Lancaster’s General Plan, there are no forests or timberlands located within the City of Lancaster. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the rezoning of forest or timberland and would not cause the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest land. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- e. See responses to Items IIa-d.

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

- a. Development proposed under the City’s General Plan would not create air emissions that exceed the Air Quality Management Plan (GPEIR p. 5.5-21 to 5.5-22). The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Code. Therefore, the project itself would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan and no impacts would occur.
- b. Construction of the proposed project would generate emissions associated with grading, use of heavy equipment, construction worker vehicles, etc. These emissions are not anticipated to exceed the construction emission thresholds established by the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) due to its small scale. Therefore, construction emissions would be less than significant.

The project would generate approximately 857 daily trips according to the traffic study submitted by Stantec on September 19, 2016. These trips would generate emissions; 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 would contain no significant stationary sources that would contribute to air quality violations. Fugitive dust would be minimized as noted under VII.b. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The project would, in conjunction with other development as allowed by the General Plan, result in a cumulative net increase of pollutants. However, since emissions associated with the proposed project would be less than significant; its contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c. The closest sensitive receptors are the single-family residences to the north, south and west of the project site. According to the traffic study, it is expected that approximately 857 new vehicle trips per day would be generated by the proposed project. Based upon the amount of traffic expected to be generated by the proposed project, no significant traffic impacts would be anticipated. Therefore, substantial pollutant concentrations would not occur and impacts would be less than significant.
- d. Construction and occupancy of the proposed project is not anticipated to produce significant objectionable odors. Construction equipment may generate some odors, but these odors would be similar to those produced by vehicles traveling on Avenue J-8 and 40<sup>th</sup> Street West. Most objectionable odors are typically associated with industrial projects involving the use of chemicals, solvents, petroleum products and other strong smelling elements used in manufacturing processes, as well as sewage treatment facilities and landfills. These types of uses are not part of the proposed project; therefore, there would be no impacts.

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

- a. A biological resources survey was conducted for the proposed project by Mark Hagan and documented in a report entitled “Biological Resources Assessment of Tentative Tract Map 66842, Lancaster, California and dated February 16, 2016.

As part of the biological resources report, pedestrian surveys were conducted on the project site on January 30, 2016 and February 6, 2016. The surveys were conducted by walking transects in an east-west direction spaced between 33 and 75 feet apart. During the surveys, three distinct

areas of habitat were identified. The portion of the project on the north side of Avenue J-8 is characteristic of a dirt lot with remnant Joshua trees. The western portion of the project site on the south side of Avenue J-8 is characteristic of a highly disturbed desert scrub habitat. The eastern 10 acres of the project site is characteristic of highly disturbed saltbush, Joshua tree and California juniper habitat. A total of 30 plant species were identified on the site and these are listed in Table 3. During the surveys, no sensitive or special status species were identified with the exception of the Joshua tree which was designated as a Candidate Species under the California Endangered Species Act in September 2020.

**Table 3  
 Observed Plant Species**

Joshua tree ( <i>Yucca brevifolia</i> )	Mule fat ( <i>Baccharis salicifolia</i> )	Shadscale ( <i>Atriplex confertifolia</i> )
Great basin sagebrush ( <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> )	California juniper ( <i>Juniperus californica</i> )	Four-wing saltbush ( <i>Atriplex canescens</i> )
Peachthorn ( <i>Lycium cooperi</i> )	Winterfat ( <i>Eurotia lanata</i> )	Hop sage ( <i>Grayia spinosa</i> )
Skeleton weed ( <i>Eriogonum</i> sp.)	Silverscale ( <i>Atriplex argentea</i> )	Matchweed ( <i>Gutierrezia lucida</i> )
Rabbit brush ( <i>Chrysothamnus nauseosus</i> )	Alkali heath ( <i>Frankenia grandifolia</i> )	Mormon tea ( <i>Ephedra nevadensis</i> )
Autumn vinegar-weed ( <i>Lessingia germanorum</i> )	Dune primrose ( <i>Oenothera deltoides</i> )	Cotton thorn ( <i>Tetradymia spinosa</i> )
Loco weed ( <i>Astragalus</i> sp.)	Saltgrass ( <i>Distichlis spicata</i> )	Schismus ( <i>Schismus</i> sp.)
Cheatgrass ( <i>Bromus tectorum</i> )	Horseweed ( <i>Canyza honariensis</i> )	Russian thistle ( <i>Salsola iberica</i> )
Tumble mustard ( <i>Sisymbrium altissimum</i> )	Five-hook bassia ( <i>Bassia hyssopifolia</i> )	Red stemmed filaree ( <i>Erodium cicutarium</i> )
Foxtail barley ( <i>Hordeum leporinum</i> )	Clover (Family: Fabaceae)	Annual burweed ( <i>Franseria acanthicarpa</i> )

In addition to the plant species observed during the surveys, a total of 26 animal species were observed (see Table 4). No sensitive or special status animal species were observed during the site visits. However, due to the presence of California ground squirrel burrows and Joshua trees, it is possible that burrowing owls and nesting birds could be on project site at the time that construction starts. Mitigation measures have been identified for both burrowing owls and nesting birds to ensure that impacts are less than significant.

**Table 4  
 Observed Animal Species**

Rodents (Order: Rodentia)	Kangaroo rat ( <i>Dipodomys</i> sp.)	Coyote ( <i>Canis latrans</i> )
California ground squirrel ( <i>Citellus beecheyi</i> )	Desert cottontail ( <i>Sylvilagus auduboni</i> )	Pocket gopher ( <i>Thomomys bottae</i> )
Domestic dog ( <i>Canis familiaris</i> )	Rock dove ( <i>Columba livia</i> )	Common raven ( <i>Corvus corax</i> )
Mourning dove ( <i>Zenaida macroura</i> )	Black-chinned hummingbird ( <i>Archilochus alexandri</i> )	Common flicker ( <i>Colaptes auratus</i> )
California quail ( <i>Callipepla californica</i> )	Black Phoebe ( <i>Sayornis nigricans</i> )	Say's phoebe ( <i>Sayornis saya</i> )

Northern mockingbird ( <i>Mimus polyglottos</i> )	Loggerhead shrike ( <i>Lanius ludovicianus</i> )	Horned lark ( <i>Eremophila alpestris</i> )
White crowned sparrow ( <i>Zonotrichia leucophrys</i> )	House sparrow ( <i>Passer domesticus</i> )	Darkling beetle ( <i>Coelocnemis californicus</i> )
Harvester ants (Order: Hymenoptera)	Ants, black, small (Order: Hymenoptera)	

### Joshua Trees

In September 2020, the California Fish and Game Commission granted the petition to consider listing the Joshua tree as threatened under the California Endangered Species Act. During this period of time, the Joshua tree is considered a Candidate Species and is afforded the same protections as a listed species.

The applicant prepared an application for an Incidental Take Permit for the Joshua trees on the project site which contained detailed information regarding the trees. This document is entitled “TTM 66842 Project, California Endangered Species Act Section 2081 Incidental Take Permit Application” and dated September 2021. As part of this application, detailed information regarding the Joshua trees were provided.

An assessment of the Joshua trees onsite was conducted by Rincon Consultants on July 22, 2021. A total of 36 Joshua trees were identified. Information regarding each tree was recorded including single vs clonal, height/age class, number of branching terminal panicles and phenophase. This information is summarized in Table 5.

Mature trees were defined as trees close to, or at, their maximum height and width (16-40 feet tall and 1-3 in diameter) with bare trunks and branches. Mature trees have the ability to reproduce and produce a seed bank. Seedlings/juvenile trees were defined as individuals not close to their maximum heights with leaves covering all or nearly all the trunks and branches. The area of impact was calculated by establishing a 186-foot radius buffer around each mature tree. Based on this calculation, the area of impact was estimated at 14.68 acres.

**Table 6  
 Joshua Tree Summary**

<b>Age</b>	<b>Total Number</b>	<b>Single</b>	<b>Clonal</b>	<b>Proposed Impact Area</b>
Mature	18	16	2	14.68
Seedling/Juvenile	18	15	3	--
Total	36	31	5	14.68

Implementation of the proposed project would result in a direct impact to all Joshua trees on site. Development of the subdivision would require the removal of all vegetation and grading of the entire site to install utilities, roadways, and the individual residences. Removal of these trees would be a significant impact without mitigation measures. The applicant would be required to

obtain an Incidental Take Permit from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). This take permit would include mitigation measures and requirements with respect to Joshua trees. Mitigation Measures 4 through 9 were proposed by the applicant in the Incidental Take Permit application. These measures are subject to change to match the measures in the approved/issued Incidental Take Permit from CDFW. The mitigation measures identified in the Incidental Take Permit shall be complied with prior to the removal of any Joshua trees from the project site. With incorporation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

### Mitigation Measures

1. Burrowing owl protocol surveys shall be conducted on the project site prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities in accordance with established burrowing owl protocols. If burrowing owls are identified using the project site during the surveys, the applicant shall contact the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to determine the appropriate mitigation/management requirements.
2. A nesting bird survey shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities. If nesting birds are encountered, all work in the area shall cease until either the young birds have fledged or the appropriate permits are obtained from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.
3. The applicant shall obtain an Incidental Take Permit from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife for the Joshua trees on the project site prior to the issuance of any construction related permits.
4. The application will designate Authorized Biologist(s) and Biological Monitor(s) that are responsible for monitoring project activities to help minimize or avoid take of individual Joshua trees and their associated habitat. These individuals will be knowledgeable and experience in the biology of Joshua trees and their associated habitat.
5. Prior to the start of construction related activities, protective fencing will be installed around habitat clearly defining the limits of work within the project site.
6. California Department of Fish and Wildlife staff will be granted access to the project site and mitigation lands to ensure compliance and effectiveness of mitigation.
7. The mitigation parcel(s) acquired will be approved by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and managed and protected from future development in perpetuity. After the acquisition of approved habitat mitigation land, the applicant will establish a conservation easement with CDFW established as a beneficiary, appoint an interim and/or long-term land manager, and draft a long-term management plan, to be approved by CDFW. An endowment fund will be calculated by conducting a Property Analysis Record (PAR) to ensure the long-term management of the habitat mitigation land acquired.
8. The applicant will provide for the implementation of start-up activities, including the initial site protection and enhancement of the habitat mitigation lands once they have been approved by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Start-up activities include, at a minimum,

- 1) preparing a final management plan for CDFW approval; 2) conducting a baseline biological assessment and land survey report within four months of recording or transfer; 3) developing and transferring GIS data, if applicable; 4) establishing initial fencing, if warranted; 5) conducting litter removal; 6) conducting initial habitat restoration or enhancement, if applicable; and 7) installing signage.
9. The applicant will provide for the interim management of the habitat mitigation lands. The applicant shall ensure that the interim land manager implements the interim management of the habitat mitigation lands as described in the final management plan and conservation easement approved by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). The interim management period shall be a minimum of three years from the date of habitat mitigation land acquisition and protection and full funding of the endowment and includes expected management following start-up activities. Interim management period activities described in the final management plan shall include fence repair, continuing trash removal, site monitoring, and vegetation and invasive species management. Applicant shall either provide a security to CDFW for the minimum of three years of interim management that the land owner, applicant, or land manager agrees to manage and pay for at their own expense; establish an escrow account with written instructions approved in advance in writing by CDFW to pay the land manager annually in advance; or establish a short-term enhancement account with CDFW or a CDFW-approved entity for payment to the land manager.
- b. The biological report prepared for the project site identifies a drainage feature at approximately 37<sup>th</sup> Street West and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) identified at least one other drainage from Goggle Earth. These drainages may fall under the jurisdiction of the CDFW and/or the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board. In order to reduce potential impacts to jurisdictional waters the following mitigation measures are required.

#### Mitigation Measures

10. The applicant shall consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to determine whether a Streambed Alteration Agreement is required for the drainage features on the project site. A copy of the agreement or documentation stating an agreement is unnecessary shall be submitted to the City of Lancaster prior to the issuance of any construction-related permits.
  11. The applicant shall consult with the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to determine if the drainage features on the project site are subject to their jurisdiction. Any necessary permits from the RWQCB shall be obtain prior to the issuance of construction permits by the City of Lancaster.
- c. There are no federally protected wetlands on the project site that fall under the provisions of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- d. The project site is not part of an established migratory wildlife corridor. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- e. The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances, such as a tree preservation policy, protecting biological resources. The proposed project would be subject to the

requirements of Ordinance No. 848, Biological Impact Fee, which requires the payment of \$770/acre to offset the cumulative loss of biological resources in the Antelope Valley as a result of development. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

- f. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans which are applicable to the project site. The West Mojave Coordinated Habitat Conservation Plan only applies to Bureau of Land Management properties and as such does not apply to the proposed project. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. <u>CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> . Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resources pursuant to §15064.5?		X		
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?				X

a-c. A cultural resources survey was conducted for the project site by Mark M. Campbell and the results were documented in a report entitled "Cultural Resource Study for Vested Tentative Tract Map 66842 Located Along Avenue J-8 Between 36<sup>th</sup> Street West and 40<sup>th</sup> Street West in the City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California" and dated January 12, 2016. An addendum to the report that included a sacred lands record search was completed May 12, 2016. The reports include records searches and a field survey.

A literature review was conducted at the South Central Coast Information Center on November 19, 2015. Archaeological reports and site records within a half mile of the project site were reviewed. A total of 20 cultural resource studies had been conducted and one prehistoric site (CA-LAN-765) was identified within a half mile of the project site. This site was a temporary camp comprised of a lithic scatter, milling features, fire-affected rock features, and small mammal bone. On November 28, 2015 a pedestrian survey of the project site was conducted by walking transects spaced approximately 15 meters apart. No historic or prehistoric cultural resources were observed on the project site. However, due to the close proximity of CA-LAN-765, one of the Native American tribes contacted requested a Native American monitor to be present on the project site. While the City does not believe that a Native American monitor is necessary, the City believes that an archaeological monitor during construction activities is warranted. As such, a mitigation measure has been identified below requiring an archaeological monitor on site.

With implementation of the identified mitigation measure, potential archaeological impacts to unknown resources would be less than significant. No human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, were discovered on the project site. However, in the event that cultural resources are encountered during the course of construction activities, all work shall cease until a qualified archaeologist determines the proper disposition of the resource.

Mitigation Measures

12. Prior to the start of construction, the applicant shall enter into an agreement with a professional archaeologist or Native American monitor to provide archaeological monitoring services during all ground disturbing activities on the project site. A copy of the executed agreement shall be submitted to the City prior to the issuance of any permits. Upon completion of construction activities, a summary report shall be submitted to the City documenting any discoveries and their disposition.

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

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

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

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

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

The project would adhere to all Federal, State, and local requirements for energy efficiency, including the Title 24 standards, as well as the project's design features and as such the project would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of building energy. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

The California Green Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11), commonly referred to as the CALGreen Code, is a statewide mandatory construction code that was developed and adopted by the California Building Standards Commission and the California Department of Housing and Community Development. CALGreen standards require new residential and commercial buildings to comply with mandatory measures under five topical areas: planning and design; energy efficiency; water efficiency and conservation; material conservation and resource efficiency; and environmental quality. An updated version of both the California Building Code and the CALGreen Code went into effect on January 1, 2020.

In 2014, Lancaster created Lancaster Choice Energy (LCE), allowing residents and businesses in Lancaster to choose the source of their electricity, including an opportunity to opt up to 100% renewable energy. SCE continues to deliver the electricity and provide billing, customer service and powerline maintenance and repair, while customers who choose to participate in this program would receive power from renewable electric generating private-sector partners at affordable rates. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

- a. The site is not identified as being in or in proximity to a fault rupture zone (LMEA p. 2-12 and Figure 2-5). According to the Seismic Hazard Evaluation of the Lancaster East and West Quadrangles, the project site may be subject to intense seismic shaking (LMEA pg. 2-16).

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

Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which the strength and stiffness of a soil is reduced by earthquake shaking or other events. This phenomenon occurs in saturated soils that undergo intense seismic shaking typically associated with an earthquake. There are three specific conditions that need to be in place for liquefaction to occur: loose granular soils, shallow groundwater (typically less than 50 feet below ground surface) and intense seismic shaking. In February 2005, the California Geologic Survey updated the Seismic Hazard Zones Map for Lancaster. Based on this map, the project site is not located in an area at risk for liquefaction. No impacts would occur.

- b. The site is rated as having a moderate risk for soil erosion (USDA SCS Maps) when cultivated or cleared of vegetation. However, there is a potential for water and wind erosion during construction. The project would be required, under the provisions of the Lancaster Municipal Code (LMC) Chapter 8.16 to adequately wet or seal the soil to prevent wind erosion. Additionally, the following mitigation measure shall be required to control dust/wind erosion.

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

#### Mitigation Measures

- 13. The applicant shall submit a Dust Control Plan to the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) for review and approval in accordance with Rule 403, Fugitive Dust, prior to the issuance of any grading and/or construction permits. This plan shall demonstrate adequate water or dust suppressant application equipment to mitigate all disturbed areas.
- c. Subsidence is the sinking of the soil caused by the extraction of water, petroleum, etc. Subsidence can result in geologic hazards known as fissures. Fissures are typically associated with faults or groundwater withdrawal, which results in the cracking of the ground surface. According to Figure 2-3 of the City of Lancaster's Master Environmental Assessment, the project site is not known to be within an area subject to fissuring, sinkholes, or subsidence (LMEA Figure 2-3) or any other form of geologic unit or soil instability. For a discussion of potential impacts regarding liquefaction, please refer to Item VII.a. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- d. The soil on the project site is characterized by a low shrink-swell potential (LMEA p. 2-5 to 7 and Figure 2-3) which is not an expansive soil as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code. A soils report for the project site shall be submitted to the City by the project developer prior to grading of the project site and the recommendations of the report shall be incorporated into the development of the property. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- e. Sewer would be available to serve the project site from Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 14 and would be utilized by the proposed project (ref. Item XIX.c and letter from the Sanitation District). The use of septic tanks or other alternative waste water disposal systems is not necessary and would not be incorporated into the development. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- f. The proposed project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or geologic feature. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

a-b. As discussed in Item III.b, the proposed project would generate air emissions during construction activities and once residences are occupied; and some of these may be greenhouse gases. These emissions are anticipated to be less than the thresholds established by the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) due to the size of the project and therefore, would not prevent the State from reaching its greenhouse gas reduction targets. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed project would be in compliance with the greenhouse gas goals and policies identified in the City of Lancaster’s General Plan (LMEA p. 2-19 to 2-24). Therefore, impacts with respect to conflicts with an agency’s plans, policies, and regulations would be less than significant.

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

a-b. The proposed project consists of the subdivision of the project site into 84 residential lots with 199 residential units. The use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials are not associated with the proposed land use. The proposed project is not located along a hazardous waste transportation corridor (LMEA p. 9.1-14 and Figure 9.1-4). The project site is currently vacant and no demolition activities would be required. Development of the proposed project would not

expose individuals or the environment to asbestos containing materials or lead-based paint. No impacts are anticipated.

- c. The project site is located within a quarter mile from an existing school, but would not generate hazardous materials. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- d. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for the proposed project by AZ Geo Technics, Inc. The findings of the study are documented in "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for a Site Located in the Vicinity of 40<sup>th</sup> Street West & Avenue J-8, In the City of Lancaster, County of Los Angeles, State of California, Tract Map #66842" and dated January 25, 2016.

As part of the environmental site assessment, a site visit was conducted on December 7, 2015 and January 20, 2016. No hazardous materials/waste were observed at the subject site; exposed surface soils did not exhibit obvious signs of discoloration. No obvious evidence (vent pipes, fill pipes, dispensers, etc.) of underground storage tanks (USTs) were noted within the area observed. No standing water was observed on the project site. Indications of former structures were not observed on the subject site. No pole- or pad-mounted transformers were observed on the project site.

In addition to the site visit, a regulatory records review was conducted for the project site. Neither the project site nor the properties within the specified search distances was identified on any regulatory databases. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

- e. The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or near a private air strip. General William Fox Airfield is located approximately 3.5 northwest of the project site. There are no circumstances related to this proximity that could be expected to result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area, therefore, no impacts would occur.
- f. The project site is located on Avenue J-8 and 40<sup>th</sup> Street West, neither of which are identified as an evacuation route (LMEA p. 9.1.-9 and Figure 9.1-3). Therefore, the proposed project would not impact or physically block any identified evacuation routes and would not interfere with any adopted emergency response plan. No impacts are anticipated.
- g. Surrounding properties are mostly developed, but vacant parcels are adjacent to the south and west of the project site. It is possible that these lands could be subject to a grass fire. However, the project site is located within the boundaries of Los Angeles County Fire Station No. 134, located at 43225 25<sup>th</sup> Street West, which would serve the project site in the event of a fire. Therefore, impacts from wildland fires would be less than significant.

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

- a. The proposed project involves the subdivision of the project site into 84 residential lots with 199 residential units which is not a use that would normally generate wastewater that would violate water quality standards or exceed waste discharge requirements. The project site is not located in an area with an open body of water or watercourse and is not in an aquifer recharge area (LMEA

p. 10.1-5 to 7). There would be no discharge into a water body or the aquifer as a result of surface runoff from the project. Additionally, the proposed project would be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program including Best Management Practices. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- b. The proposed project would not include any groundwater wells or pumping activities. All water supplied to the proposed project would be obtained from Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40 (LACWD). Additionally, the proposed project is not in an area identified as having a high potential for infiltration (LMEA p. 10.1-5 to 6). Therefore, the proposed project would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge and impacts would be less than significant.
- c. Development of the project site would increase the amount of surface runoff as a result of impervious surfaces. The proposed project would be designed, on the basis of a hydrology study, to accept current flows entering the property and to handle the additional incremental runoff from the developed site. Runoff would be directed into the City stormwater system. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The project site is designated as Zone X-Shaded per the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) No. 06037C0415F (9/26/08), which is outside the 100-year flood zone but within the 500-year flood zone. Therefore, no flooding impacts would occur as a result of placing structures on the project site.

- d. The project site does not contain and is not downstream from a dam or levee. Therefore, no impacts would occur from flood as a result of the failure of a dam/levee. The project site is not located within a coastal zone. Therefore, tsunamis are not a potential hazard. The project site is relatively flat and does not contain any enclosed bodies of water and is not located in close proximity to any other large bodies of water. Therefore, the proposed project would not be subject to inundation by seiches or mudflows and no impacts would occur.
- e. The proposed project would not conflict or obstruct the implementation of the applicable water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. For additional information see responses X.a through X.c. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- a. The proposed project is a continuation of the existing, surrounding land-use pattern. There is no established, definable community that would be bisected or otherwise affected by the construction of homes at the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- b. The proposed project is consistent with the City’s General Plan and must be in conformance with the Lancaster Municipal Code. The proposed project will be in compliance with the City-adopted Uniform Building Code (UBC) and erosion control requirements (Section VII). Additionally, as noted Section IV, the project site is not subject to and would not conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

a-b. The project site does not contain any current mining or recovery operations for mineral resources and no such activities have occurred on the project site in the past. It is not likely that the Lancaster area has large, valuable mineral and aggregate deposits. Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources would occur.

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

- a. There would be a temporary increase in noise levels in the area during construction of the project. This noise would be generated by construction vehicles and equipment. Construction activities 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. These effects are not considered significant because they are temporary and construction times are limited to daylight hours. Residential areas tend to have higher activity levels in the mornings and evenings as residents go to and from work or school, and on the weekends, but noise levels from these activities are localized and generally minimal. Impacts would be less than significant.

The City's General Plan (Table 3-1) establishes an outdoor maximum CNEL of 65 dBA for residential uses. Table 8-11 of the LMEA provides existing roadway noise levels near the project site. The current noise level on Avenue J-8 (35<sup>th</sup> Street West to 30<sup>th</sup> Street West) is estimated at 62.2 dBA and the noise level on 40<sup>th</sup> Street West from Avenue J to Avenue K is estimated at 60.2 dBA. While this noise level is consistent with the standards of the General Plan, additional features of the proposed project (e.g., landscaping, distance buffer from Avenue J-8) would ensure that the project remains in compliance with the General Plan. Therefore, potential noise impacts associated with traffic from the proposed development would be less than significant.

Permanent increases in area levels would occur once the residences are occupied. These noise levels would be generated by typical activities that occur in a residential neighborhood and from motor vehicles. Although the traffic generated by the proposed would contribute to an increase in noise levels in the area, the project's contribution would be minimal because the current and

future project noise levels would remain essentially unchanged with or without the project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- b. It is not anticipated that construction of the proposed project would require the use of machinery that generates ground-borne vibration as no major subsurface construction is planned. The proposed residential use of the site would not normally generate groundborne vibration or noise, either. Therefore, no impacts associated with ground-borne vibration/noise are anticipated.
- c. The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan. General William Fox Airfield is located approximately 3.5 northwest of the project site. Due to this distance, any noise associated with the airfield is not anticipated to impact the proposed project. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- a. The proposed project would advance adopted policies and plans supporting alternative transportation by providing bicycle paths on Avenue J-8. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- b. A traffic study was prepared for the proposed subdivision by Stantec, entitled “Tentative Tract Map No. 66842, Residential Project, Traffic and Circulation, City of Lancaster, CA” and dated September 19, 2016. Based on this traffic study, the proposed project would not generate operational impacts at intersections in the vicinity of the project site.

In July 2020, the City of Lancaster adopted standards and thresholds for analyzing projects with respect to vehicle miles traveled (VMT). A series of screening criteria were adopted and if a project meets one of these criteria, a VMT analysis is not required. These criteria are: 1) project site – generates fewer than 110 trips per day; 2) locally serving retail – commercial developments of 50,000 square feet or smaller; 3) project located in a low VMT area – 15% below baseline; 4) transit proximity; 5) affordable housing; and 6) transportation facilities.

The proposed project is located in an area that meets Criteria 3 and as such is not subject to a VMT analysis. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c. Avenue J-8 and 40<sup>th</sup> Street West will be improved to City standards adjacent to the site as part of the project. No hazardous conditions would be created by these improvements. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- d. The project would have emergency access from Avenue J-8. Interior circulation would be provided in accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles County Fire Department; therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

- a. No tribal cultural resources have been identified either through the sacred lands file search conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission or by any of the Native American tribes with cultural affiliations to the area. A mitigation measure for cultural resources monitoring during construction has been included at the request of one of the tribes due to a previously identified archaeological site within a half mile of the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

- a. The proposed project would be required to connect into the existing utilities such as electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, telecommunications, etc. These services already exist in the general area. Connections would occur on the project site or within existing roadways or right-of-ways. Connections to these utilities are assumed as part of the proposed project and impacts to environmental resources have been discussed throughout the document. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The Los Angeles County Waterworks District (LACWD) No. 40 has indicated in a letter dated December 8, 2016, that there is either sufficient potable water available for the project or that a process is in place where potable water can be secured for the project. Securing sufficient potable water for the project is the sole responsibility of the applicant. No new construction of water treatment facilities or new or expanded entitlements would be required. Therefore, water impacts would be less than significant.

- c. The proposed project would discharge to the District's Trunk "F" Trunk Sewer located in Avenue J at 35<sup>th</sup> Street West. According to the letter dated April 29, 2016 from the County Sanitation District of Los Angeles (LACSD), this 21-inch diameter trunk sewer has a design capacity of 4.6 million gallons per day (mgd) and conveyed a peak flow of 1.2 mgd when last measured in 2011. The project's wastewater would be treated at the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant upon connection which has a design capacity of 18 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 13.2 mgd. The expected average wastewater flow from the proposed project is 22,620 gallons per day. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- d-e. The project would generate additional solid waste, which would contribute to an overall cumulative impact on the landfill service to the site (GPEIR p. 5.9-20 to 21); although this project's individual contribution is considered minimal. Individual residential units within the project would 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 Assembly Bill (AB) 939, which was enacted to reduce, recycle, and reuse solid waste generated in California to the maximum extent feasible. AB 939 required a 25% diversion of solid waste from landfills by 1995 and a 50% diversion by 2005. In 2011, AB 341 was passed which requires the State to achieve a 75% reduction in solid waste by 2030. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

a. See Item IX.f

b-d. The project site is not located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. The project site is located within the service boundaries of an existing fire station which can adequately serve the project site. Other fire stations are also located in close proximity to the project site which can provide service if needed. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

a-c. Cumulative impacts are the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. The proposed project would not create any impacts with respect to agricultural/forest resources or mineral resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to a cumulative impact for these resources.

There are several approved projects within approximately ½ mile of the project site. These projects, if constructed, would convert a substantial number of acres from vacant desert to developed uses which could generate cumulative impacts. Table 6 provides a list of these projects.

**Table 6  
 Related Projects List**

<b>Case No.</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>APNs</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Status</b>
TTM 60430	NWC of Ave K and 36 <sup>th</sup> St W	3153-020-007 thru 009, 014, thru 017, 031	23	Subdivision for 82 lots in the R-7,000 zone	Under Construction
TTM 61681	NWC of Ave J-12 and 35 <sup>th</sup> St W	3153-021-003, 004, 023, 027	15	Subdivision for 58 lots in the R-7,000 zone	Approved
TTM 62121	NWC of Ave K and 40 <sup>th</sup> St W	3153-025-019	30.3	Subdivision of 115 lots in the R-7,000	Approved
TTM 60664	Btw Ave K and Ave K-4 approx 200 feet east of Buena Vista Way	3110-013-036	8	Subdivision of 39 lots in the R-7,000 zone	Approved
TTM 61535	SWC of Ave J and 45 <sup>th</sup> St W	3153-024-003, 021-040, 046	57.6	Subdivision of 240 lots in the R-7,000 zone	Approved
TTM 62578	West of 40 <sup>th</sup> St W at Ave J-12	3153-025-040, 041	19.38	Subdivision of 87 lots in the R-7,000 zone	Under Construction
TTM 62643	NWC of Ave J-8 and 45 <sup>th</sup> St W	3153-026-011, 013-018, 031	24.92	Subdivision of 93 lots in the R-7,000 zone	Approved

Many of the impacts generated by these projects are site specific and generally do not influence the impacts on another site. These projects are also not likely to be constructed at the same time and some may never be constructed at all. All projects undergo environmental review and have required mitigation measures to reduce impacts when warranted. These mitigation measures reduce environmental impacts to less than significant impacts whenever possible. Mitigation measures are in place to ensure that impacts associated with biological resources, cultural resources, and geology and soils (dust control) remain less than significant. All other environmental factors associated with the project would be less than significant. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

List of Referenced Documents and Available Locations\*:

BRR1:	Biological Resource Assessment of Tentative Tract Map 66842 Lancaster, California, February 16, 2016, Mark Hagan	DSD
BRR2:	TTM 66842 Project, California Endangered Species Act Section 2081 Incidental Take Permit Application (Draft), September 2021, Rincon Consultants, Inc.	DSD
CRS1:	Cultural Resource Study for Vested Tentative Tract Map 66842 Located Along Avenue J-8 Between 36 <sup>th</sup> Street West and 40 <sup>th</sup> Street West in the City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California, January 12, 2016, Mark M. Campbell	DSD
CRS2:	Addendum to the Cultural Resource Study for Vested Tentative Tract Map 66842 Located Along Avenue J-8 Between 36 <sup>th</sup> Street West and 40 <sup>th</sup> Street West in the City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California, May 12, 2016, Mark M. Campbell	DSD
ESA:	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, For A Site Located in the Vicinity of 40 <sup>th</sup> Street West & Avenue J-8, In the City of Lancaster, County of Los Angeles, State of California, Tract Map #66842, January 25, 2016, AZ Geo Technics, Inc.	DSD
FIRM:	Flood Insurance Rate Map	DSD
GPEIR:	Lancaster General Plan Environmental Impact Report	DSD
LACSD:	County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, April 29, 2016	DSD
LACW:	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40, December 8, 2016	DSD
LGP:	Lancaster General Plan	DSD
LMC:	Lancaster Municipal Code	DSD
LMEA:	Lancaster Master Environmental Assessment	DSD
SSHZ:	State Seismic Hazard Zone Maps	DSD
TRA:	Tentative Tract Map No. 66842 Residential Project, Traffic and Circulation Study, City of Lancaster, CA, September 19, 2016	DSD
USGS:	United States Geological Survey Maps	DSD
USDA SCS:	United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Maps	DSD

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