



COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT

City of Lancaster Revised Initial Study

- 1. Project title and File Number:**
Conditional Use Permit No. 21-001
Tentative Tract Map No. 24-001
General Plan Amendment No. 21-001
Zone Change No. 21-001
- 2. Lead agency name and address:**
City of Lancaster
Community Development Department
Planning and Permitting Division
44933 Fern Avenue
Lancaster, California 93534
- 3. Contact person and phone number:**
Jocelyn Swain, Senior Planner
City of Lancaster
Community Development Department
(661) 723-6100
- 4. Location:**
±10 acres at the southeast corner of Avenue
L and 15th Street West
(APNs: 3109-026-032, -040, -042, -044)
(see Figure 1)
- 5. Applicant name and address:**
Westlanc Partners, LLC
Attn: Julian Torkan
1401 Westwood Boulevard, Suite 320
Los Angeles, CA 90024
- 6. General Plan designation:**
Current: Non-Urban Residential (NU)
Proposed: Mixed Use
- 7. Zoning:**
Current: RR-2.5 (Rural Residential, minimum lot
size 2.5 acres)
Proposed: MU-C (Mixed Use - Commercial)
- 8. Description of project:**

The proposed project consists of the construction and operation/occupancy of a mixed-use development on the southeast corner of 15th Street West and Avenue L. The development would consist of a 235-room hotel; two apartment buildings with a total of 181 units; three restaurant/retail pads totaling 12,800 square feet and a 3,800 square foot club house associated with the hotel. The two apartment buildings would be located along 15th Street West while the hotel would be located along the southern property line. The restaurant/retail pads would front Avenue L or would be located along the eastern property line.



Figure 1, Project Location Map

The buildings on the project site would range in height from 23’ for the retail/restaurant pads and clubhouse to a maximum of 58’ 8” for the two apartment buildings. The hotel would be 48’ 6”. Access to the project site would be from two driveways located on 15th Street West. A total of 799 parking spaces would be provided for the project in the center of the site. Most of the parking for the apartments and hotel would be provided underground. Landscaping would be provided along the perimeter and throughout the project site. The project would also include street improvements along Avenue L and 15th Street West.

As part of the proposed project, a tentative tract map, general plan amendment and zone change have also been requested. The tentative tract map would subdivide the subject property into six parcels. The general plan designation and zoning on the subject property is currently Non-Urban Residential (NU) and RR-2.5 (rural residential, minimum lot size 2.5 acres). The General Plan Amendment and Zone Change would change these designations to Mixed-Use (MU) and Mixed Use – Commercial (MU-C).

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The project site is located in a rapidly growing area of the central portion of the City of Lancaster. The property immediately to the south is developed with a single-family residence. The area to the south and southwest of the subject project is developed with single family residences on large lots. The property immediately east of the subject property is Caltrans right-of-way/Antelope Valley Freeway. On the east side of the freeway, the property is either vacant or contains two single family residences. To the north of the project site, on the north side of Avenue L, is vacant land followed by the Kaiser Permanente medical offices. To the northwest of the project site on the northwest corner of Avenue L and 15th Street West is an apartment/townhome complex. To the immediate west of the project site, the property is vacant; however, an application had been filed on it for a Maverik fueling station and convenience market. This application has been withdrawn and the Maverik fueling station is not moving forward. Further to the west, on the north side of Avenue L is a mix of residential subdivisions and commercial uses. To the east of the project site, and the Antelope Valley Freeway, is the Costco commercial center with a gas station and other retail uses (north side of Avenue L). Other uses in the general vicinity include Lancaster City Park, apartment complexes, the auto mall, commercial/retail center at the southeast corner of Avenue L and 10th Street West, a church, and vacant land. Table 1 provides a summary of the zoning and uses immediately adjacent to the project site.

**Table 1
Zoning/Land Use Information**

Direction	Zoning		Land Use
	City	County	
North	OP	N/A	Vacant
East	CPD	N/A	Caltrans right-of-way, freeway, and single-family residence
South	RR-2.5	N/A	Single-family residence
West	RR-2.5	N/A	Vacant

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

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

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District
- Los Angeles County Fire Department
- White Fence Farm Mutual Water Company
- Los Angeles County Sanitation District #14 (upon annexation)
- Southern California Edison

- 11.** Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

In accordance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18, consultation letters for the proposed project were sent to 13 individuals associated with eight tribes who have requested to be included in the process or whose contact information was provided to the City. These letters were mailed on July 26, 2024, via certified return receipt mail and include the letter, site plan, and a copy of the cultural resources report. Table 2 identifies the tribes, the person to whom the letter was directed, and the date the letter was received.

Responses were received from the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation (YSMN), Fernandeano Tataviam Band of Mission Indians (FTBMI), and Morongo Band of Mission Indians. While no specific tribal cultural resources were identified, mitigation measures were requested to address the inadvertent discovery of cultural resources, worker education, and tribal monitoring. These mitigation measures have been included in the cultural resources section.

**Table 2
Tribal Notification**

Tribe	Person/Title	Date Received
Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians	Sarah Brunzell / Manager	August 1, 2024
Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation	Andrew Salas / Chairman	August 1, 2024
Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation (formerly San Manuel Band of Mission Indians)	Alexandra McCleary / CRM Senior Manager	August 1, 2024
Kern Valley Indian Community	Brandy Kendricks, Tribal Member Monitor	August 1, 2024
Kern Valley Indian Community	Robert Robinson, Chairperson	August 5, 2024
Morongo Band of Mission Indians	Ann Brierty, THPO	August 1, 2024
Morongo Band of Mission Indians	Robert Martin, Chairperson	August 1, 2024
Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation	Jordan Joaquin, President	August 8, 2024
Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation	Jill McCormick, Historic Preservation Officer	August 8, 2024
Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation	Manfred Scott, Acting Chairman Kw'ts'an Cultural Committee	August, 8, 2024
San Fernando Band of Mission Indians	Donna Yocum, Chairperson	August 2, 2024
Serrano Nation of Mission Indians	Mark Cochrane, Co-Chairperson	Returned to Sender
Serrano Nation of Mission Indians	Wayne Walker, Co-Chairperson	Returned to Sender


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 Resources	Forestry	<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

March 18, 2025
 Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

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

- a. The City of Lancaster General Plan identifies five scenic areas in the City and immediately surrounding area (LMEA Figure 12.0-1). Views of these scenic areas are not generally visible from the project site or the immediately surrounding roadways. However, views of the open desert and mountains surrounding the Antelope Valley are available from the project site and nearby roadways (Avenue L, 15th Street West, Antelope Valley Freeway). The proposed project consists of the construction and operation/occupancy of a mixed-use development consisting of a hotel, apartments, and restaurant/retail pads. As part of the project approval, the applicant is also requesting a tentative tract map, a general plan amendment and zone change. The tentative tract map would subdivide the project into six parcels while the general plan amendment and zone change would change the designations on the project site to Mixed-Use and Mixed Use - Commercial, respectively. This development will be similar in appearance to other commercial/residential developments in the vicinity of the project particularly those around the intersection of 10th Street West and Avenue L (e.g., Costco fueling station and retail development) and the townhome/apartment complex at the northwest corner of 15th Street West and Avenue L. With implementation of the proposed project, the views would not change and would continue to be available from the roadways and project site. Therefore, no impact would occur.
- b. The project site is not located along any designated State Scenic Highways. There are no State designated scenic routes or highways within the City of Lancaster. Additionally, there are no rock

outcroppings or buildings on the project site. There are approximately 28 Joshua trees (not counting individuals within clusters) on the site in various conditions. However, the site is highly disturbed and not representative of high quality Joshua tree habitat. The Antelope Valley Freeway (State Route 14) is designated in the City's Master Environmental Assessment as a local scenic roadway because of the views of the mountain ranges to the north and south of the valley while traveling on the freeway. The project site is located immediately to the west of the Antelope Valley Freeway. While the project site is adjacent to the freeway, the construction of the project would not impact the views available to the traveling motorists. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c. The project site is located in an area that meets the definition of an "urbanized area" per CEQA Guidelines Section 15387. Urbanized area means a "central city or a group of contiguous cities with a population of 50,000 or more, together with adjacent densely populated areas having a population density of at least 1,000 persons per square mile." The City's population in the last census was over 173,000 and the U.S. Bureau of Census considers the Lancaster-Palmdale region urbanized. Additionally, the project site is located within the central portion of the City adjacent to two high-volume roadways (e.g., State Route 14 and Avenue L) and surrounded by a variety of land uses including medical, commercial, high density residential, and single family residential. Therefore, the standard utilized in the analysis was for urban areas.

The proposed project would be consistent with the development standards for the MU-C zone and other requirements of the zoning code as it pertains to this use and zone (see Land Use and Planning section) with the approval of the general plan amendment and zone change. The project would be consistent with the City's Design Guidelines which were adopted on December 8, 2009 (and updated on March 30, 2010). These guidelines provide the basis to achieve quality design for all development within the City. Additionally, the multi-family residential buildings would comply with the objective design standards that were recently adopted with the implementation of the Housing Element. The proposed development complies with these requirements through the use of landscaping, architectural elements on the buildings, and the outdoor seating areas. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- d. The ambient lighting in the vicinity of the project site is moderate due to street lights, security and operational lighting from surrounding developments (residential, medical and commercial uses), vehicle headlights from vehicles utilizing Avenue L and the Antelope Valley Freeway. Lighting to the south of project site is less due to the low-density residential nature of the properties; however, ambient lighting still exists from the residential uses and light spillage from the freeway. Light and glare would be generated from the proposed project in the form of additional street lighting, parking lot/building security lighting and from motor vehicles associated with residents, employees, visitors, and delivery trucks. All lighting associated with the proposed development would be shielded and focused downward onto the project site and the landscaping included as part of the project would provide additional buffering the neighboring residential uses. The height of the hotel along the southern boundary would also provide some additional buffering between the onsite lighting and the residential uses to the south. Additionally, the proposed development would not produce substantial amounts of glare as the development would be constructed primarily from non-reflective materials. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

The maps for each county are updated every two years. The latest available map for Los Angeles County is from 2020. According to the 2020 map, the project site is designated as Other Land. Other Land is defined as “land not included in any other mapping category. Common examples include low density rural developments, brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing, confined livestock, poultry, or aquaculture facilities, strip mines, borrow pits, and water bodies smaller than 40 acres. Vacant and nonagricultural land surrounded on all sides by urban development and greater than 40 acres is mapped as Other Land.”

As the project site is not designated as farmland of importance by the State nor is it currently utilized for agricultural purposes, no impacts to agricultural resources would occur.

- b. The project site is currently zoned RR-2.5 (rural residential, minimum lot size 2.5 acres) which does allow agricultural uses. However, the applicant is requesting a general plan amendment and zone change to change the land use designation to MU (Mixed Use) and the zoning to MU-C (Mixed-Use Commercial) neither of which allow agricultural uses. Additionally, the project site is located in the central portion of the city immediately adjacent to and west of the Antelope Valley Freeway. While the property to the south, west, of the project site is zoned RR-2.5 and does allow for agricultural uses, the property to the north of the project site is zoned OP (Office Professional) and the property to the east, on the east side of the freeway, is zoned Commercial Planned Development (CPD). These zoning designations do not allow agricultural uses. Additionally, the project site and none of the surrounding properties are under agricultural production nor are they subject to a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- c-d. According to the City of Lancaster’s General Plan, there are no forests or timberlands located within the City of Lancaster. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the rezoning of forest or timberland and would not cause the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest land. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- e. See responses to Items IIa-d.

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

a. Development proposed under the City’s General Plan would not create air emissions that exceed the Air Quality Management Plan (GPEIR pgs. 5.5-21 to 5.5-22). The proposed project involves a general plan amendment and zone change to change the project site from NU and RR-2.5 to MU and MU-C. This is a denser use which has the potential to emit more emissions than would be emitted if the project site was developed with the four single-family residential dwellings permitted under the zone. However, the area just north of the project site is zoned as OP (Office Professional); the property to the northwest is zoned HDR (High Density Residential) and the property to the east of the freeway is zoned CPD. These properties and other properties in the immediately surrounding area are developed with apartments, subdivisions, commercial developments, etc. As discussed in III.b, the emissions from construction and operation of the proposed project would be less than significant and below the thresholds established by the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) to protect public health and to meet State Implementation Plan goals. As such, the proposed project’s emissions would already have been accounted for within the Air Quality Management Plan. Additionally, the proposed project would be required to comply with all AVAQMD Rules and Regulations including those associated with dust control, permitting, and use of hazardous materials. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan and no impacts would occur.

- b. An air quality study was prepared for the proposed project by Metropolis Architecture, Inc. and documented in a report entitled “Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis Report for a 10.126 Acre Commercial Project Development in City of Lancaster, California.

The project site is located within the boundary of the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) and therefore, is subject to compliance with the thresholds established by the AVAQMD. These thresholds are identified in the AVAQMD’s California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Federal Conformity Guidelines document, dated August 2016 and summarized in Table 3.

**Table 3
AVAQMD Air Quality Thresholds**

Criteria Pollutant	Daily Threshold (pounds)	Annual Threshold (Tons)
Oxides of Nitrogen (NO _x)	137	25
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)	137	25
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	548	100
Oxides of Sulfur (SO _x)	137	25
Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	82	15
Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	65	12
Hydrogen Sulfide (H ₂ S)	54	10
Lead (Pb)	3	0.6

Construction and operational emissions were calculated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) with inputs regarding the project, including construction activities and schedule, provided by the applicant and contained within the air quality appendix. All construction activities would comply with the air district rules and regulations regarding dust control and VOC content in architectural coatings. Tables 4 and 5 provides the estimated construction and operational emissions, respectively. As can be seen in these tables, the emissions associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.

**Table 4
Construction Emissions Summary**

Year	Maximum Daily Emissions (lbs/day)						Total Annual Emissions (tons/year)					
	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
2025	8.27	69.1	62.6	.19	11.9	6.5	1.21	2.91	1.91	0.00	0.30	0.15
2026	3.39	25	24.1	0.08	2.14	1.9	1.15	2.29	1.94	0.00	010	0.08
2027	42.9	10.6	17.6	0.06	1.65	1.39	1.47	1.35	0.72	0.00	0.04	0.03
Threshold	137	137	548	137	82	64	25	25	100	25	15	12
Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

**Table 5
Operational Emissions**

Year	Maximum Daily Emissions (lbs/day)						Total Annual Emissions (tons/year)					
	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Mobile	3.61	1.99	19.2	0.08	4.29	1.20	0.62	1.35	3.85	0.01	0.82	0.33
Area	89.5	1.78	111	0.22	15.8	17.5	5.01	1.07	5.62	0.01	0.78	0.64
Total	93.11	3.77	130.2	0.3	20.09	18.7	5.63	2.42	9.47	0.02	1.6	0.97
Threshold	137	137	548	137	82	64	25	25	100	25	15	12
Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

c. The closest sensitive receptors are the residential uses immediately south of the project site. Additionally, there are other residential uses on large lots in the general area and residential subdivisions and multi-family developments on the north side of Avenue L to the east and west. Based on the Vehicle Miles Traveled analysis prepared for the proposed project, the development would generate a total of 3,656 net daily trips. These trips would generate emissions; however, the amount of traffic generated by the project is not sufficient to significantly impact nearby intersections or roadways and create or contribute considerably to violations of air quality standards on either a localized or regional basis. Therefore, substantial pollutant concentrations would not occur and impacts would be less than significant.

According to the AVAQM CEQA and Federal Conformity Guidelines, the following types of projects proposed for sites within the specified distance to an existing or planned (zoned) sensitive receptor land use must be evaluated for the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, including those resulting in a cancer risk greater than or equal to 10 in a million and/or a HI [non-cancerous] greater than or equal to 1:

- Any industrial project within 1,000 feet of a sensitive receptor land use;
- A distribution center (40 or more trucks per day) within 1,000 feet;
- A major transportation project (50,000 or more vehicles per day) within 1,000 feet;
- A dry cleaner using perchloroethylene within 500 feet; and
- A gasoline dispensing facility within 300 feet.

As the proposed project does not include any of these uses, a health risk assessment was not prepared and the proposed mixed use development would not expose nearby residents to substantial pollutant concentrations.

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

Valley Fever is not contagious, and therefore, cannot be passed on from person to person. Most of those who are infected would recover without treatment within six months and would have a life-long

immunity to the fungal spores. In severe cases, especially in those patients with rapid and extensive primary illness, those who are at risk for dissemination of disease, and those who have disseminated disease, antifungal drug therapy is used.

Nearby sensitive receptors as well as workers at the project site could be exposed to Valley Fever from fugitive dust generated during construction. There is the potential that cocci spores would be stirred up during excavation, grading, and earth-moving activities, exposing construction workers and nearby sensitive receptors to these spores and thereby to the potential of contracting Valley Fever. Additionally, driving on dirt roadways (which is already occurring) could stir up dust. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure 21 (see Geology and Soils) which requires the project operator to implement dust control measures in compliance with AVAQMD Rule 403, and implementation of Mitigation Measure 1, which was developed in conjunction with Los Angeles County Public Health, would minimize the risk of exposure. The measure requires the training of all construction personnel, providing personal protective respiratory equipment to construction workers request, establishes best management practices for the construction site and provides information to all construction personnel, visitors, and nearby residents about Valley Fever. With implementation of these measures and compliance with all AVAQMD rules and regulations, the risk of exposure to Valley Fever would be minimized to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures

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

The project operator also shall consult with the Los Angeles County Public Health to develop a Valley Fever Dust Management Plan that addresses the potential presence of the *Coccidioides* spore and mitigates for the potential for *Coccidioidomycosis* (Valley Fever). Prior to issuance of

permits, the project operator shall submit the Plan to the Los Angeles County Public Health for review and comment. The Plan shall include a program to evaluate the potential for exposure to Valley Fever from construction activities and to identify appropriate safety procedures that shall be implemented, as needed, to minimize personnel and public exposure to potential *Coccidioides* spores. Measures in the Plan shall include the following:

- Provide HEP-filters for heavy equipment equipped with factory enclosed cabs capable of accepting the filters. Cause contractors utilizing applicable heavy equipment to furnish proof of worker training on proper use of applicable heavy equipment cabs, such as turning on air conditioning prior to using the equipment.
- Provide communication methods, such as two-way radios, for use in enclosed cabs.
- Require National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH)-approved half-face respirators equipped with minimum N-95 protection factor for use during worker collocation with surface disturbance activities, as required per the hazard assessment process.
- Cause employees to be medically evaluated, fit-tested, and properly trained on the use of the respirators, and implement a full respiratory protection program in accordance with the applicable Cal/OSHA Respiratory Protection Standard (8 CCR 5144).
- Provide separate, clean eating areas with hand-washing facilities.
- Install equipment inspection stations at each construction equipment access/egress point. Examine construction vehicles and equipment for excess soil material and clean, as necessary, before equipment is moved off-site.
- Train workers to recognize the symptoms of Valley Fever, and to promptly report suspected symptoms of work-related Valley Fever to a supervisor.
- Work with a medical professional to develop a protocol to medically evaluate employees who develop symptoms of Valley Fever.
- Work with a medical professional, in consultation with the Los Angeles County Public Health, to develop an educational handout for on-site workers and surrounding residents within three miles of the project site, and include the following information on Valley Fever: what are the potential sources/ causes, what are the common symptoms, what are the options or remedies available should someone be experiencing these symptoms, and where testing for exposure is available. Prior to construction permit issuance, this handout shall have been created by the project operator and reviewed by the project operator and reviewed by the Community Development Director. No less than 30 days prior to any work commencing, this handout shall be mailed to all existing residences within a specified radius of the project boundaries as determined by the Community Development Director. The radius shall not exceed three miles and is dependent upon the location of the project site.
- When possible, position workers upwind or crosswind when digging a trench or performing other soil-disturbing tasks.
- Prohibit smoking at the worksite outside of designated smoking areas; designated smoking areas will be equipped with handwashing facilities.
- Post warnings on-site and consider limiting access to visitors, especially those without adequate training and respiratory protection.

- Audit and enforce compliance with relevant Cal OSHA health and safety standards on the job site.
- d. Construction of the proposed project is not anticipated to produce significant objectionable odors. Construction equipment may generate some odors, but these odors would be similar to those produced by vehicles traveling on Avenue L and the Antelope Valley Freeway. 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. The proposed project is a mixed-use development with multi-family residential, retail/restaurant pads, and a hotel. The development does not contain any uses that typically generate objectionable odors. Therefore, potential odor impacts would be less than significant.

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

- a. The proposed project consists of a general plan amendment and zone change to change the general plan and zoning designations on the project site to MU (Mixed-Use) and MU-C (Mixed Use - Commercial), respectively. A conditional use permit and tentative tract map have also been requested for the construction and operation/occupancy of a mixed-use development consisting of two apartment

buildings, a hotel with associated club house, and three retail/restaurant pads and the subdivision of the site into six individual parcels.

A biological resources report for the property site was conducted by Callyn D. Yorke, PhD and documented in a biological resources report entitled “Biological Resources Report on APN 3109-026-32, 40, 42, 44, 9 Acres, SEC Avenue L and 15th Street West, Lancaster, California” and dated May 2023.

A field survey of the project site was conducted on May 4 and May 5, 2023. The survey included a pedestrian survey of the perimeter of the project site followed by transects across the project site spaced approximately 30 feet apart. Additionally, the California Department of Fish & Game Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) was referenced for locations of sensitive species in the Lancaster-Palmdale area. During the surveys, a total of 29 plant species were observed on the project site including Joshua trees. These species are identified in Table 6.

**Table 6
Observed Plant Species**

Burroweed (<i>Ambrosia Dumosa</i>)	Cheesebush (<i>Ambrosia Salsola</i>)	Joshua tree (<i>Yucca brevifolia</i>)
Russian knapweed (<i>Acroptilon repens</i>)	Cudweed aster (<i>Corethrogyne filaginifolia</i>)	Telegraph weed (<i>Heterotheca grandifolia</i>)
Foxtail chess (<i>Bromus madritensis</i>)	Creosote bush (<i>Larrea tridentata</i>)	Rabbitbush (<i>Ericameria nauseosa</i>)
Winterfact (<i>Krascheninnokovia lanata</i>)	Anderson thornbush (<i>Lycium andersonni</i>)	Redstem filaree (<i>Erodium cicutarium</i>)
Knapweed (<i>Centaurea</i> sp)	Hairy fleabane (<i>Conzya bonariensis</i>)	Russian thistle (<i>Salsola iberica</i>)
Tumble mustard (<i>Sisymbrium altissimum</i>)	Four-wing saltbush (<i>Atriplex canescens</i>)	Nevada joint fir (<i>Ephedra nevadensis</i>)
Spiny saltbush (<i>Atriplex spinifera</i>)	Cheat brome (<i>Bromus tectorum</i>)	Soft chess (<i>Bromus mollis</i>)
Turkey mullein (<i>Eremocarpus setigerus</i>)	Creeping bentgrass (<i>Agrostis stolonifera</i>)	Indian rice grass (<i>Oryzopsis hymenoides</i>)
Rye Brome (<i>Bromus secalinus</i>)	Six weeks fescue (<i>Festuca octoflora</i>)	Desert needlegrass (<i>Stipa speciosa</i>)
Mediterranean grass (<i>Schimus barbatus</i>)	Skeleton weed (<i>Eriogonum deflexum</i>)	

Joshua trees have been a candidate species for listing under the California Endangered Species Act since September 2020. In July of 2023, the California State Legislature passed the Joshua Tree Conservation Act. This act identified the payment of a mitigation fee based on tree height as the mitigation required as part of the issuance of an Incidental Take Permit under the Act. It also required the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to prepare a Western Joshua Tree Conservation Plan by December 2024 and for the Fish and Game Commission to adopt said plan by June 2025. At the time of this document, the Plan is still in the public draft stage.

The site supports approximately 28 Joshua trees with two additional clusters of three to six individuals. The Joshua trees on site range in height from 0.5 feet to 15 feet with an average height of 8 feet. Approximately 29% of the trees on the site are in poor health and the remaining 71% are in fair to good health. At the time of the survey, none of the trees contained nesting birds. Development of the proposed project would require the removal of all of the Joshua trees from the site which requires that the applicant obtain either an Incidental Take Permit under traditional procedures or a permit from the

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) under the Joshua Tree Conservation Act. As part of the application for a Take Permit, a Joshua tree census of all of the trees on site would be required include GPS coordinates, pictures, and tree measurements including height. A mitigation measure has been included below requiring the developer to obtain such permit prior to the issuance of any construction related permits. The applicant is also required to comply with the requirements of the Western Joshua Tree Conservation Plan once adopted by the Fish and Game Commission. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant. No other sensitive plant species, including listed or candidate plant species, were identified on the project site or are expected to occur.

During the survey of the project site, a total of 16 wildlife species or their sign were observed. These species are identified in Table 7. Additionally, a burrowing owl clearance survey was conducted at the same time as the biological surveys. No sign of burrowing owl was found on or adjacent to the project site. However, it is possible that they could move onto the subject property prior to the start of construction. Additionally, suitable habitat for nesting birds is present on the project site. As such, a mitigation measure has been included for preconstruction surveys for both burrowing owls and nesting birds. With implementation of these measures, impacts to nesting birds and burrowing owls would be less than significant.

No desert tortoises or suitable habitat for the species was observed on the project site. The project site is highly disturbed and located in the central portion of the City, adjacent to both State Route 14 and Avenue L. It is also not connected to other undisturbed areas which could support a desert tortoise population. The property surrounding the project site is developed with single family residences, apartment complexes, medical and commercial uses.

Additionally, the site may contain suitable habitat for legless lizards, which are a species of special concern. This species could reside in the leaf-litter under the trees and shrubs which are present on site and other occurrences of the species have been documented within two miles. As such, a mitigation measure has been identified below. With incorporation of the identified mitigation measure, impacts would be less than significant. No other sensitive or special status wildlife species were observed or expected to occur on the project site.

**Table 7
Observed Animal Species**

Western whiptail (<i>Aspidoscelis tigris</i>)	House finch (<i>Carpodacus mexicanus</i>)	Cactus wren (<i>Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus</i>)
Red-tailed hawk (<i>Buteo regalis</i>)	Mourning dove (<i>Zenaida macroura</i>)	Common raven (<i>Corvus corax</i>)
Desert cottontail (<i>Sylvilagus audubonii</i>)	Merriam's kangaroo rat (<i>Dipodomys merriami</i>)	Deer mouse (<i>Peromyscus maniculatus</i>)
Domestic dog (<i>Canis familiaris</i>)	Coyote (<i>Canis latrans</i>)	Desert woodrat (<i>Neotoma lepida</i>)
Northern mockingbird (<i>Mimus polyglottos</i>)	Black-tailed jack rabbit (<i>Lepus californicus</i>)	California ground squirrel (<i>Otospermophilus beecheyi</i>)
Anna's hummingbird (<i>Calypte anna</i>)		

Mitigation Measures

2. The project applicant shall obtain a Western Joshua Tree Conservation Act permit from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to remove the Joshua trees on 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. A copy of the fully executed permit shall be provided to the City of Lancaster prior to the issuance of any construction-related permits.
3. The project applicant shall comply with the conservation measures identified in the Western Joshua Tree Conservation Plan upon adoption by the California Fish and Game Commission, to the extent feasible.
4. A nesting bird and raptor survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 7 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities. The qualified biologist shall survey the entire project site and areas within a biologically defensive buffer zone surrounding the project site. If project activities are delay or suspended for more than 7 days during the nesting season, the nesting bird and raptor survey shall be repeated. If active bird nests are identified during the survey, the species shall be identified and a no-disturbance buffer shall be established around the active nest. At a minimum, a buffer of 500 feet around active raptor nests and 100 feet around migratory bird species nests shall be established. Personnel working on the project, including all contractors working onsite, shall be instructed on the presence of nesting birds, restricted areas, and adherence to no-disturbance buffers. A qualified biologist shall periodically monitor any active bird nests to determine if project-related activities occurring outside the “no-disturbance” buffer disturbs the birds and if the buffer shall be increased. Once the young have fledged and left the nest, or the nest otherwise becomes inactive under natural conditions, project activities within the “no-disturbance” buffer may occur following an additional survey by the qualified biologist to search for any new bird nests in the restricted area.
5. A pre-construction burrowing owl clearance survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to any vegetation removal or ground disturbing activities to avoid impacts to burrowing owls and/or occupied burrows. The pre-construction clearance survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and in accordance with the methods outlined in the *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation* (CDFG 2012). Documentation of surveys and findings shall be submitted to the City of Lancaster for review and file. If no burrowing owls or occupied burrows are detected, project activities may begin, and no additional avoidance and minimization measures shall be required.

If an occupied burrow is found outside, but within 500 feet, of the development footprint, the qualified biologist shall establish a “no-disturbance” buffer around the burrow location(s). The size of the “no-disturbance” buffer shall be determined in consultation with CDFW and be based on the species status (i.e., breeding, non-breeding) and proposed level of disturbance. If an occupied burrow is found within the development footprint, the qualified biologist shall prepare an Impact Assessment and Burrowing Owl Mitigation Plan in accordance with CDFW’s Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. The project proponent shall contact CDFW to develop appropriate mitigation and management procedures and a final Burrowing Owl Mitigation Plan shall be submitted to the City and CDFW for review and approval prior to project activities.

If burrowing owl presence is confirmed, the Project proponent shall offset impacts by acquiring CDFW-approved mitigation lands for the species. The potential mitigation land shall have the following: 1) have presence of burrowing owl; 2) replace the impacted burrowing owl habitat area at a minimum of 2:1 ratio to ensure no net loss of habitat; and 3) be of equivalent or greater habitat value than that of the project site. Prior to acquisition of potential mitigation land, the project proponent shall provide CDFW with the appropriate documentation for property eligibility. Requested documentation may include, but is not limited to, a biological report, preliminary title report, mineral risk assessment report, and Phase I Environmental Site Assessment report. Following CDFW written approval of potential mitigation land, the project proponent shall protect the land in perpetuity under a conservation easement dedicated to a local land conservancy or other appropriate entity that has been approved to hold and manage mitigation lands pursuant to Assembly Bill 1094. Recordation of the conservation easement shall occur prior to commencement of project activities. An appropriate endowment, to be determined by CDFW, shall also be provided for the long-term monitoring and management of mitigation lands.

6. Within 72 hours of the start of project-related activities, a qualified biologist with the appropriate handling permits shall conduct a survey to determine presence of north California legless lizard. The qualified biologist shall survey the proposed impact areas and a 50-foot buffer. Surveys shall incorporate appropriate methods to detect these species, including individuals that could be concealed in burrows, beneath leaf litter, or in loose soil prior to any project activities in area that have or may have the potential to support these species. If any special-status species is found, the qualified biologist shall contact CDFW and the species shall be passively ushered out of harm's way to an area that is unaffected by the project. If the project requires SCC to be removed, disturbed, or otherwise handled, the qualified biologist shall obtain all appropriate permits and prepare a species-specific list (or plan) of proper handling and passive relocation protocols. The list (or plan) of protocols shall be implemented during project construction.
- b. The project site does not contain any riparian habitat. The project site does contain Joshua trees which are a Candidate Species under the California Endangered Species Act. Impacts to this species and appropriate mitigation have been identified under IV.a. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.
 - c. There are no State or federally protected wetlands on the project site as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
 - d. The project site is not part of an established migratory wildlife corridor as it is surrounded by major roadways and development. It also does not connect to larger undeveloped properties. 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. This fee is required of all projects occurring on previously undeveloped land regardless of the biological resources present and is utilized to enhance biological resources through education programs and the acquisition of property for conservation. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

- f. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans which are applicable to the project site. The West Mojave Coordinated Habitat Conservation Plan only applies to federal land, specifically land owned by the Bureau of Land Management. In conjunction with the Coordinated Management Plan, a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) was proposed which would have applied to all private properties within the Plan Area. However, this HCP was never approved by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife nor was it adopted by the local agencies (counties and cities) within the Plan Area. As such, there is no HCP that is applicable to the project site and no impacts would occur.

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

a-c. A cultural resource survey was conducted for the project site by RT Factfinders Cultural Resources and documented in a report entitled “Updated Phase I Cultural Resource Investigation for 15th Street West and Ave L Commercial Project, 9.5 Acres Southeast of the Intersection of 15th Street West and West Avenue L, Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California” dated January 2021.

A records search was conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) for the subject property and a half mile radius. No previous on-foot surveys of the project site had been conducted and no previously recorded resources were identified for the project site. A total of 18 surveys have occurred within a half mile of the project site. No prehistoric resources were identified during these surveys. A few historic resources were identified (homesites, refuse deposits), but not near the project site. Additionally, a records search of the Sacred Lands file by the Native American Heritage Commission yielded negative results.

A field survey of the project site was originally completed on October 4, 2014 and updated on September 26, 2018. The property was originally surveyed by walking a series of east/west trending parallel transects spaced approximately 15 meters apart beginning in the northwest corner. The updated pedestrian survey was conducted on September 26, 2018 by walking pedestrian transects spaced 5 to 10 meters apart. This survey confirmed the findings of the original report. No prehistoric resources were identified on the project site. One late historic period site was identified (Site 579-1). This site is a historic period residential site characterized by three major features; two concrete slab foundations and a rectangular wood lined gravel and cobble filled feature. These features are described in detail in the cultural resources report.

In addition to the features, the site also has remnants of a two or three strand barbed wire fence running north/south along with scattered debris throughout the property. One major concentration was noted which measures 10 by 12 meters and contained red brick fragments, window pane glass, pieces of carpet, milled wood, cinder blocks, tarpaper, sanitary seam cans, aerosol cans, matchstick fill cans, shoe fragments, glass fragments and a condiment jar. Based on the artifact types and relative diagnostic marker styles present, the assemblage dates to the mid-20th century. The site was evaluated against the

eligibility criteria for listing and was determined to be not significant. Therefore, impacts to this resource would be less than significant. Additionally, no human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, were identified on the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

While no specific tribal or cultural resources have been identified on the project site during the AB 52/SB 18 process, the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation (YSMN), Fernandeano Tataviam Band of Mission Indians (FTMBI), and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians (MBBI) have all requested the inclusion of specific measures to address the proper treatment of any previously unidentified cultural resources, worker education/training, and tribal monitoring. All requested measures have been identified below. With incorporation of the mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

7. In the event that cultural resources are discovered during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) shall cease and a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall be hired to assess the find. Work on the other portions of the project outside of the buffered area may continue during this assessment period. Additionally, the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation Cultural Resources Department (YSMN) shall be contacted, regarding any pre-contact finds and be provided information after the archaeologist makes his/her initial assessment of the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment.
8. If significant pre-contact cultural resources, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), are discovered and avoidance cannot be ensured, the archaeologist shall develop a Monitoring and Treatment Plan, the drafts of which shall be provided to YSMN for review and comment. The archaeologist shall monitor the remainder of the project and implement the Plan accordingly.
9. If human remains or funerary objects are encountered during any activities associated with the project, work in the immediate vicinity (within a 100-foot buffer of the find) shall cease and the County Coroner shall be contacted pursuant to State Health and Safety Code §7050.5 and that code enforced for the duration of the project.
 - a. Inadvertent discoveries of human remains and/or funerary object(s) are subject to California State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, and the subsequent disposition of those discoveries shall be decided by the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), as determined by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), should those findings be determined as Native American in origin.
 - b. Should human remains and/or cremations be encountered on the surface or during any and all ground-disturbing activities (i.e., clearing, grubbing, tree and bush removal, grading, trenching, fence post placement and removal, construction excavation, excavation for all water supply, electrical, and irrigation lines, and landscaping phases of any kind), work in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall immediately stop within a 100-foot perimeter of the discovery. The area shall be protected; project personnel/observers will be restricted. The County Coroner is to be contacted within 24 hours of discovery. The County Coroner has 48 hours to make his/her determination pursuant to State and Safety Code §7050.5. and Public Resources Code (PRC) § 5097.98.

- c. In the event that the human remains and/or cremations are identified as Native American, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of determination pursuant to subdivision (c) of HSC §7050.5.
 - d. The Native American Heritage Commission shall immediately notify the person or persons it believes to be the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The MLD has 48 hours, upon being granted access to the Project site, to inspect the site of discovery and make his/her recommendation for final treatment and disposition, with appropriate dignity, of the remains and all associated grave goods pursuant to PRC §5097.98
 - e. If the Morongo Band of Mission Indians has been named the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), the Tribe may wish to rebury the human remains and/or cremation and sacred items in their place of discovery with no further disturbance where they will reside in perpetuity. The place(s) of reburial will not be disclosed by any party and is exempt from the California Public Records Act (California Government Code § 6254[r]). Reburial location of human remains and/or cremations will be determined by the Tribe's Most Likely Descendant (MLD), the landowner, and the City Planning Department.
10. The Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation Cultural Resources Management Department (YSMN) shall be contacted of any pre-contact cultural resources discovered during project implementation, and be provided information regarding the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment. Should the find be deemed significant, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), a Cultural Resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan shall be created by the archaeologist, in coordination with YSMN, and all subsequent finds shall be subject to this Plan. This Plan shall allow for a monitor to be present that represents YSMN for the remainder of the project, should YSMN elect to place a monitor on-site.
 11. Any and all archaeological/cultural documents created as a part of the project (isolate records, site records, survey reports, testing reports, etc.) shall be supplied to the applicant and Lead Agency for dissemination to YSMN. The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with YSMN throughout the life of the project.
 12. If cultural resources are discovered during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) shall cease and a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards retained by the project applicant shall assess the find. Work on the portions of the Projects outside of the buffered area may continue during this assessment period. Should the find be deemed significant, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), the Project applicant shall retain a professional Tribal Monitor procured by the FTBMI to observe all remaining ground-disturbing activities including, but not limited to, clearing, grading, excavating, digging, trenching, plowing, drilling, tunneling, quarrying, leveling, driving posts, auguring, blasting, stripping topsoil or similar activity, and archaeological work.
 13. The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with the FTBMI on the disposition and treatment of any Tribal Cultural Resource encountered during all ground disturbing activities.
 14. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall enter into a Tribal Monitoring Services Agreement with the Morongo Band of Mission Indians (MBMI) for the Project. The Tribal Monitor shall be on-site during all ground-disturbing activities (including, but not limited to, clearing, grubbing, tree and bush removal, grading, trenching, fence post placement and removal,

construction excavation, excavation for all utility and irrigation lines, and landscaping phases of any kind). The Tribal Monitor shall have the authority to temporarily divert, redirect, or halt the ground-disturbing activities to allow identification, evaluation, and potential recovery of cultural resources.

15. Prior to any ground-disturbing activities (including, but not limited to, clearing, grubbing, tree and bush removal, grading, trenching, fence post replacement and removal, construction excavation, excavation for all utility and irrigation lines, and landscaping phases of any kind), and prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Applicant shall retain a Qualified Archaeologist who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior Standards (SOI). The Archaeologist shall be present during all ground-disturbing activities to identify any known or suspected archaeological and/or cultural resources. The Archaeologist will conduct a Cultural Resource Sensitivity Training, in conjunction with the Tribe[s] Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO), and/or designated Tribal Representative. The training session will focus on the archaeological and tribal cultural resources that may be encountered during ground-disturbing activities as well as the procedures to be followed in such an event.
16. Prior to any ground-disturbing activities the project Archaeologist shall develop a Cultural Resource Management Plan (CRMP) and/or Archaeological Monitoring and Treatment Plan (AMTP) to address the details, timing, and responsibilities of all archaeological and cultural resource activities that occur on the project site. This Plan shall be written in consultation with the consulting Tribe[s] and shall include the following: approved Mitigation Measures (MM)/Conditions of Approval (COA), contact information for all pertinent parties, parties' responsibilities, procedures for each MM or COA, and an overview of the project schedule.
17. The retained Qualified archeologist and Consulting Tribe[s] representative shall attend the pre-grade meeting with the grading contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the monitoring plan.
18. During all ground-disturbing activities the Qualified Archaeologist and the Tribal Monitor shall be on-site full-time. The frequency of inspections shall depend on the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, and any discoveries of Tribal Cultural Resources as defined in California Public Resources Code Section 21074. Archaeological and Tribal Monitoring will be discontinued when the depth of grading and the soil conditions no longer retain the potential to contain cultural deposits. The Qualified Archaeologist, in consultation with the Tribal Monitor, shall be responsible for determining the duration and frequency of monitoring.
19. In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources are unearthed during construction, the Qualified Archaeologist and the Tribal Monitor shall have the authority to temporarily divert and/or temporarily halt ground-disturbance operations in the area of discovery to allow for the evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. Isolates and clearly non- If a potentially significant cultural resource(s) is discovered, work shall stop within a 60-foot perimeter of the discovery and an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) physical demarcation/barrier constructed. All work shall be diverted away from the vicinity of the find, so that the find can be evaluated by the Qualified Archaeologist and Tribal Monitor[s]. The Archaeologist shall notify the Lead Agency and consulting Tribe[s] of said discovery. The Qualified Archaeologist, in consultation with the Lead Agency, the consulting Tribe[s], and the Tribal Monitor, shall determine the significance of the discovered resource. A recommendation for the treatment and disposition of the Tribal Cultural Resource shall be made by the Qualified Archaeologist in consultation with the Tribe[s] and the Tribal Monitor[s]

and be submitted to the Lead Agency for review and approval. Below are the possible treatments and dispositions of significant cultural resources in order of CEQA preference:

- a. Full avoidance.
 - b. If avoidance is not feasible, preservation in place.
 - c. If preservation in place is not feasible, all items shall be reburied in an area away from any future impacts and reside in a permanent conservation easement or deed restriction.
 - d. If all other options are proven to be infeasible, data recovery through excavation and then curation in a curation facility that meets the Federal Curation Standards (CFR 79.1)
20. The final report(s) created as a part of the project (AMTP, isolate records, site records, survey reports, testing reports, etc.) shall be submitted to the Lead Agency and Consulting Tribe(s) for review and comment. After approval of all parties, the final reports are to be submitted to the Eastern Information Center and Consulting Tribe(s).

	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.

The air quality report estimated the amount fuel that would be consumed by off-road construction equipment and on-road vehicles (workers and delivery trucks). The report estimated that the project would consume 66,899 gallons of diesel fuel (0.002% of the State’s annual demand) for off-road construction equipment and 17,333 gallons of fuel for on-road vehicles. The study also estimated the amount of vehicle fuel consumed during yearly operations to be 78,278 gallons.

The fuel energy consumed during construction would be temporary and would not represent a significant demand on energy resources. In addition, some incidental energy conservation would occur during construction through compliance with State requirements that equipment not in use for more than five minutes be turned off. Project construction equipment would also be required to comply with the latest EPA and CARB engine emissions standards. These emissions standards require highly efficient combustion systems that maximize fuel efficiency and reduce unnecessary fuel consumption.

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

The proposed project would consume energy for interior and exterior lighting, heating/ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC), refrigeration, electronics systems, appliances, and security systems, among other things. The proposed project would be required to comply with Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency

Standards, which provide minimum efficiency standards related to various building features, including appliances, water and space heating and cooling equipment, building insulation and roofing, and lighting. Implementation of the Title 24 standards significantly reduces energy usage. Furthermore, the electricity provider is subject to California's Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS). The RPS requires investor-owned utilities electric service provides, and community choice aggregators (CCA) to increase procurement from eligible renewable energy resources to 33 percent of total procurement by 2020 and to 50 percent of total procurement by 2030. Renewable energy is generally defined as energy that comes from resources, which are naturally replenished within a human timescale such as sunlight, wind, tides, waves, and geothermal heat. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- 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. The current version of both the California Building Code and the CalGreen Code went into effect on January 1, 2023. The latest version of both codes is scheduled to go into effect on January 1, 2026.

In 2014, the City of Lancaster created Lancaster Choice Energy (LCE), allowing residents and businesses in Lancaster to choose the source of their electricity; the standard power mix is 35% renewable with the opportunity to opt up to 100% renewable energy. SCE continues to deliver the electricity and provide billing, customer service and powerline maintenance and repair, while customers who choose to participate in this program, would receive power from renewable electric generating private-sector partners at affordable rates.

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

- a. The project site is not identified as being in or in proximity to a fault rupture zone (LMEA Figure 2-5). According to the Seismic Hazard Evaluation of the Lancaster East and West Quadrangles, the project site may be subject to intense seismic shaking (LMEA pg. 2-16). However, the proposed project would be constructed in accordance with the seismic requirements of the Uniform Building Code (UBC) adopted by the, which would render any potential impacts to a less than significant level. The site is generally level and is not subject to landslides (SSHZ).

Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which the strength and stiffness of a soil is reduced by earthquake shaking or other events. This phenomenon occurs in saturated soils that undergo intense seismic shaking typically associated with an earthquake. There are three specific conditions that need to be in place for liquefaction to occur: loose granular soils, shallow groundwater (usually less than 50 feet below ground surface) and intense seismic shaking. In April 2019, the California Geologic Survey updated the Seismic Hazard Zones Map for Lancaster (SSHZ) (<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>). Based on these maps, the project site is not located in an area at risk for liquefaction. No impacts would occur.

- b. The project site is rated as having a low risk for soil erosion (USDA SCS Maps) when cultivated or cleared of vegetation. However, there remains a potential for water and wind erosion during construction. The proposed project would be required, under the provisions of the Lancaster Municipal Code (LMC) Chapter 8.16, to adequately wet or seal the soil to prevent wind erosion and comply with dust control provisions of the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District. Additionally, with implementation of the mitigation measure identified below, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

21. The applicant shall submit the required Construction Excavation Fee to the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) prior to the issuance of any grading and/or construction permits. This includes compliance with all prerequisites outlined in District Rule 403, Fugitive Dust, including submission and approval of a Dust Control Plan, installation of signage and the completion of a successful onsite compliance inspection by an AVAQMD field inspector. Proof of compliance shall be submitted to the City.
- c. Subsidence is the sinking of the soil caused by the extraction of water, petroleum, etc. Subsidence can result in geologic hazards known as fissures. Fissures are typically associated with faults or groundwater withdrawal, which result in the cracking of the ground surface. According to Figure 2-3 of the City of Lancaster's Master Environmental Assessment, the closest sinkholes and fissures to the project site are located in the vicinity of 20th Street West and Lancaster Boulevard, approximately 2.5 miles north of the project site. The project site is not known to be within an area of subject to sinkholes, subsidence (LMEA Figure 2-3) or any other form of soil instability. Additionally, all water for the project would come from the White Fence Farm Mutual Water Company which is the water provider for the area. No ground water wells or pumping would occur on site. The groundwater basin has been adjudicated and the amount of water that individual water companies can pump has been determined by the courts. The proposed project would be required to have a geotechnical study prepared and all recommendations followed as part of the building permit process. These recommendations would ensure that any impacts associated with forms of soil instability, including subsidence, would be less than significant. For a discussion of potential impacts regarding liquefaction, please refer to Item VI.a.

- d. The soil on the project site is characterized by a low shrink/swell potential (LMEA Figure 2-3), which is not an expansive soil as defined by Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code. A soils report on the soils within the project site shall be submitted to the City by the project developer prior to grading of the property and the recommendations of the report shall be incorporated into the development of the property. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- e. The proposed project would be tied into the sanitary sewer system. No septic or alternative means of waste water disposal are part of the proposed project. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- f. The proposed project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or geologic feature. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

- a. The proposed project consists of the construction and operation/occupancy of a mixed-use development consisting of 181 apartment units, a 235-room hotel with club house, and 12,800 square feet of retail/restaurant pads. An air quality and greenhouse gas analysis was prepared for the project by Metropolis Architecture, Inc. and documented in a report entitled “Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis Report for a 10.126 Acre Commercial Project Development in City of Lancaster, California” and dated August 15, 2024.

Direct project-related greenhouse gas emissions include emissions from construction activities, area sources, mobile sources, and refrigerants while indirect sources include emissions from energy consumption, water demand, and solid waste generation. CalEEMod was utilized to calculate direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions. The Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District has established 100,000 tons of GHG emissions as the threshold in its CEQA guidelines document. Table 8 and Table 9 provide the construction and operational GHG emissions respectively. The GHG emissions for construction and operation are substantially lower than the AVAQMD thresholds on both a daily basis and a yearly basis. The combined total of construction and operational annual GHG would be 1,446 MTCO_{2e}, which is also substantially lower than the AVAQMD’s threshold. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**Table 8
Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Year	Maximum Daily Emissions (lbs CO _{2e})	Total Annual Emissions (MTCO _{2e})
2025	16,147	391
2026	5,011	290
2027	2,872	91.1
AVAQMD Threshold	548,000	100,000
Exceed Threshold?	No	No

**Table 9
Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Source	Maximum Daily Emissions (lbs CO₂e)	Total Annual Emissions (MTCO₂e)
Mobile	3,834	495
Area	2,281	89.1
Energy	372	62.1
Water	81.1	13.9
Waste	83.0	13.7
Refrigerants	0.78	0.13
Total	6,652	674
AVAQMD Threshold	548,000	100,000
Exceed Threshold?	No	No

Additionally, the development would be required to comply with the requirements of the City's Net Zero Energy Ordinance, Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance, and other requirements which increase the efficiency of buildings and reduce air emissions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- b. The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable policies of the 2022 Scoping Plan. This plan provides measures to achieve Senate Bill (SB) 32 targets and the SCAG RTP/SCS contains measures to achieve VMT reductions required under SB 375. An analysis of the project’s consistency with the RTP/SCS is discussed in the land use section.

Additionally, the City of Lancaster’s Climate Action Plan was adopted in March 2017. This plan identifies projects that would enhance the City’s ability to further reduce GHG emissions. A total of 61 projects across eight sectors were identified which include 1) traffic; 2) energy; 3) municipal operations; 4) water; 5) waste; 6) built environment; 7) community and 8) land use. Forecasts for both community and government operations were prepared for 2020, 2030, 2040, and 2050. Under all scenarios assessed, the City meets the 2020 target and makes substantial progress towards achieving post-2020 reductions.

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

Transportation

- Measure 4.1.2b: Bike Lanes / Measure 4.1.2c: Pedestrian Amenities – The project would make improvements to Avenue L and 15th Street West along their project frontages to meet the City standards. Improvements along major and secondary arterials typically include the installation of meandering sidewalks and bike lanes.

Energy

- Measure 4.2.1a: Renewable Energy Purchase Plan – All developments receive their power from Lancaster Choice Energy. Individual tenants within the apartments will have the ability to opt out and utilize Southern California Edison. LCE’s standard mix provides power that is 35% renewable while customers can upgrade to the 100% renewable energy plan. Additionally, solar would be incorporated within the site, mostly likely on building rooftops.

Water

- Measure 4.4.1a: Recycled Water Line Expansion – The project would be required to install “purple pipes” along the project frontage to facilitate the ultimate connection to the City’s recycled water line system.
- Measure 4.4.2a: Sensor Technology – Water saving irrigation will be installed with the landscaping on the project site. Specifically, drip irrigation with rain sensors will be installed.

Waste

- Measure 4.5.1b: Recycling Incentives – The development will have the appropriate number of trash enclosures which will include areas to separate waste into trash, recycling, and organics.

Community

- Measure 4.7.3a: Xeriscaping – All landscaping within the development would be native and/or drought tolerant in accordance with the City’s Municipal Code.
- Measure 4.7.4c: Conservation Habitat Acquisition – All development projects are required to pay a Biological Impact Fee (\$770/acre) to offset the overall loss of biological resources within the Antelope Valley. This fee is utilized to fund the acquisition of habitat which is placed under a conservation easement. The proposed development would be required to pay approximately \$7,700.

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

a-b. The proposed project consists of the construction and operation/occupancy of a mixed-use development consisting of 181 apartment units, 235-room hotel with associated club house and 12,800 square feet of restaurant/retail space. The project also includes the subdivision of the subject property

into 6 lots and a general plan amendment/zone change to change the designation of the project site to Mixed Use and Mixed Use – Commercial. Typical construction materials would be utilized during the development of the proposed project. Occupants and tenants of the development would utilize typical cleaners (e.g., cleanser, bleach, etc.), fertilizer and potentially limited use of common pesticides. They would also utilize typical hazardous materials for building maintenance and repair, maintenance of the on-site pools, etc. These uses would be similar to other commercial and residential uses in the area. The project site is currently vacant and no demolition would be necessary. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose individuals or the environment to asbestos contain materials (ACM) or lead-based paint. Additionally, while the project site is located adjacent the Antelope Valley Freeway which has been designated as a hazardous materials transportation corridor, these activities are heavily regulated and the proposed project would not create an impact. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c. The project site is not located within a quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The closest school to the project site is Valley View Elementary School located at 3317 Avenue L-8. This is approximately 1.5 miles southwest of the project site. Additionally, although the proposed project would utilize hazardous materials, it would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous/ acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- d. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for the project site by Krazan & Associates and documented in a report entitled “Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Proposed Commercial Property, 1340 West Avenue L, APNS: 3109-026-032, -040, -42, -044 (Approximately 10 Acres), Lancaster, California” dated November 25, 2020.

A survey of the project site was conducted on November 12, 2020 with the objective of identifying any recognized environmental conditions, including hazardous substances and petroleum products, in connection with the property (including soils, surface waters, and groundwater). No evidence of hazardous substances/petroleum products, above/underground storage tanks, pipelines, odors, stained soil, drums, polychlorinated biphenyl contain equipment, unidentified containers, soil piles, stressed vegetation, wastewater, waste pits, ponds, lagoons, sumps, oil/water separators, septic systems, wells, or retention ponds were observed on the project site. Two concrete pad foundations were observed in the northwestern portion of the site. No environmental concerns were noted with these foundations.

In addition to the survey of the project site, a search of existing regulatory databases was conducted by EDR for the subject property and surrounding properties within specified search distances. Both the subject property and a property within the specified search distances were identified in regulatory databases:

- Project Site: The subject site was identified within the Hazardous Waste Tracking System (HWTS) database that is maintained by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and tracks the disposal of hazardous wastes. According to the property owner, during the demolition of the former dwelling, asbestos containing building material was identified and properly disposed of to the appropriate disposal facility. Based on the dates associated with the dwelling demolition and the date of the HWTS activity, this database listing appears to be confirmation of the disposal. This listing does not pose a significant environmental concern to the site.
- 42653 15th Street West: This property was identified in the Historical UST database maintained by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Based on the removal of the UST and the lack of

evidence of a release, this former farm tank does not appear to represent a significant environmental concern to the site.

Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- e. The project site is not located within two miles of an airport or within the boundaries of an airport land use plan. The nearest airfield, Air Force Plant 42, is located approximately 2.5 miles to the southeast of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose residents to a safety hazard or noise associated with an airport. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- f. The traffic generated by the proposed project is not expected to block the roadways in the vicinity of the project site. Improvements have been conditioned as part of the project that would ensure that traffic operates smoothly. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact or physically block any identified evacuation routes and would not interfere with any adopted emergency response plan. Impacts would not occur.
- g. Portion of the property to the south and the properties to the north, and west are undeveloped and could be subject to vegetation fires. Additionally, the property to the east is the Caltrans right-of-way and Antelope Valley Freeway which could also be subject to vegetation fires. However, the project site is located within the boundaries of Fire Station No. 134, located at 43225 25th Street West. This fire station would serve the project site in the event of a fire with additional support available from other fire stations. Therefore, impacts from wildland fires would be less than significant.

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

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

comprehensive storm water quality program to manage urban storm water and minimize pollution of the environment to the maximum extent practicable. The reduction of pollutants in urban storm water discharge through the use of structural and nonstructural Best Management Practices (BMPs) is one of the primary objectives of the water quality regulations. BMPs that are typically used to management runoff water quality include controlling roadway and parking lot contaminants by installing oil and grease separators at storm drain inlets, cleaning parking lots on a regular basis, incorporating peak-flow reduction and infiltration features (grass swales, infiltration trenches and grass filter strips) into landscaping and implementing educational programs. The proposed project would incorporate appropriate BMPs during construction, as determined by the City of Lancaster Public Works Department. 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 the White Fence Farms Mutual Water Company after meeting the agency's requirements. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- c. Development of the proposed project would increase the amount of surface runoff as a result of impervious surfaces associated developing the project site with a mixed-use development. A majority of the project site would be paved or covered with structures with landscaping/pervious surfaces provided throughout. The proposed project would be designed, on the basis of a hydrology study, to accept current flows entering the property and to handle the additional incremental runoff from the developed sites. Therefore, impacts from drainage and runoff would be less than significant.

The project site is designated as a mixed of both Flood Zone X and Flood Zone X-Shaded per Flood Insurance Rate Map (06037C0420F). Flood Zone X is located outside of both the 100-year and 500-year flood zone while Flood Zone X-Shaded is located outside of the 100-year but within the 500-year flood zone. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

a. The proposed project consists of the construction and operation/occupancy of a mixed-use development consisting of 181 multi-family residential units, a 235-room hotel with associated club house, and 12,800 square feet of restaurant/retail space. The project site is currently zoned for single family residences on 2.5 acre lots (RR-2.5) and does not allow for this type of mixed-use development. The applicant is requesting a general plan amendment and zone change to change the designations to MU (Mixed-Use) and MU-C (Mixed Use - Commercial), respectively, which would allow for the proposed development. Additionally, the applicant is requesting the subdivision of the property into six lots so that each use/building is on its own lot. The properties to the immediate south are developed with single family residences while the property to the west is vacant. The northern boundary is formed by Avenue L which is an improved roadway. The eastern boundary of the project site is formed the Antelope Valley Freeway. The project site is located at the southeast corner of 15th Street West and Avenue L. The proposed project would not block a public street, trail, or other access route or result in a physical barrier that would divide the community. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

b. The proposed project would be consistent with the City’s General Plan and development standards of the Lancaster Municipal Code with the approval of the proposed General Plan Amendment (GPA No. 21-001) and Zone Change (ZC No. 21-001). Table 10 provides a consistency analysis of the proposed project with respect to the relevant goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan assuming approval of the general plan amendment and zone change. Additionally, 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.

Due to the requested change in zoning from a residential zoning to a non-residential zoning, an analysis of the State’s No Net Loss with respect to housing was conducted. California’s No Net Loss Law guarantees that a city or county, maintains an adequate allocation of affordable housing units so as to meet its unmet housing needs under each income category. The No Net Loss Law also guarantees that a jurisdiction is able to maintain its adequate supply of housing under its Housing Element sites inventory without reducing the potential capacity for new development.

The project site is currently zoned RR-2.5 which would allow for one single family residence per 2.5-acre lot. Under the current zoning, four single-family residences could be constructed. The subject property is not listed as a site to be utilized to meet the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers (9,023 housing units for the 2021-2029 cycle) in the City’s certified Housing Element. While the zoning is proposed to be changed to MU-C, this zone would continue to allow for different types of residential uses and represents an upzoning over the current project site zoning. The proposed project would develop a total of 181 multi-family residential units in two buildings with associated amenities. This is an increase of 177 units over what is currently allowed. Development of the site as proposed would assist the City in meeting its’ current RHNA numbers. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

**Table 10
General Plan Consistency Analysis**

Goals, Objectives and Policies	Consistency Analysis
Policy 3.1.1: Ensure that development does not adversely affect the groundwater supply.	No groundwater pumping will occur as part of the proposed project. All water supplied to the development will be provided by the White Fence Farms Mutual Water Company upon completion of all requirements.
Policy 3.1.3: Encourage the use of recycled tertiary treated wastewater when possible.	The project is required to install purple pipe in the landscaped median along Avenue L to facilitate the use of recycled tertiary treated water when it becomes available.
Policy 3.2.1: Promote the use of water conservation measures in the landscape plans of new developments.	The landscaping proposed as part of the project would be aesthetically pleasing and native/drought tolerant in accordance with the City of Lancaster’s Municipal Code, Section 8.50 and the development standards of the mixed use zones.
Policy 3.2.5: Promote the use of water conservation measures in the design of new developments.	The proposed facility will be designed and constructed in compliance with the Uniform Building Code and the California Green Building Code which include water conservation requirements.
Policy 3.3.1: Minimize the amount of vehicular mile traveled.	The proposed development is a mixed-use development in the central portion of the City that would provide residential and employment opportunities in the same location. Additionally, employment opportunities exist in the immediate vicinity of the project site (e.g., commercial developments, Kaiser, etc.). The commercial component screens out of the VMT analysis due to the restaurant/retail pads being less than 50,000 square feet. The VMT analysis prepared for the apartments and hotel uses indicated that the project needs to reduce the VMT generated by 185.7 VMT. This will be accomplished by payment

	of the City’s VMT Mitigation Fee. Additionally, the proposed project would provide another source of jobs for the local economy. This will allow residents to work in the Antelope Valley instead of commuting to the Los Angeles basin for work. This would reduce the amount of VMT generated for work-based trips.
Policy 3.3.2: Facilitate the development and use of public transportation and travel modes such as bicycle riding and walking.	The proposed project would install bicycle parking and provide meandering sidewalks along the Avenue L and 15 th Street West frontages. This would encourage the use of other forms of transportation for employees and visitors.
Policy 3.3.3: Minimize air pollutant emissions by new and existing development.	The proposed project would comply with all air district regulations regarding air emissions and dust control. Mitigation has been included to minimize dust and stationary equipment on site would be required to comply with any necessary AVAQMD permitting requirements.
Policy 3.3.4: Protect sensitive uses such as homes, schools, and medical facilities, from the impacts of air pollution.	The proposed project would generate air emissions during construction and operation. However, these emissions would be below the thresholds established by the AVAQMD. Additionally, all activities would comply with existing rules and regulations.
Policy 3.4.4: Ensure that development proposals, including City sponsored projects, are analyzed for short- and long-term impacts to biological resources and that appropriate mitigation measures are implemented.	Section IV of this initial study discusses the biological resources on the project site and identifies mitigation measures to ensure impacts to these resources are less than significant.
Policy 3.5.1: Minimize erosion problems resulting from development activities.	The proposed project will comply with all dust control and erosion measures. These include best management practices as identified in NPDES and the air quality regulations pertaining to dust control.
Policy 3.6.1: Reduce energy consumption by establishing land use patterns which would decrease automobile travel and increase the use of energy efficient modes of transportation.	The proposed project is a mixed-use development located in the central portion of the City near all necessary amenities.
Policy 3.6.2: Encourage innovate building, site design, and orientation techniques which minimize energy use.	The proposed project would be constructed in accordance with the Uniform Building Code and the California Green Building Code. To the extent feasible solar and battery storage would be incorporated into the buildings.
Policy 3.6.3: Encourage the incorporation of energy conservation measures in existing and new structures.	The proposed project would be constructed in accordance with the Uniform Building Code and the California Green Building Code. To the extent feasible solar and battery storage would be

	incorporated into the buildings.
Policy 3.6.6: Consider and promote the use of alternative energy such as wind energy and solar energy.	The proposed project would obtain its energy from Lancaster Choice Energy which provides energy from a variety of sources including wind and solar. Additionally, the proposed project would install solar panels and battery storage on the buildings to the extent feasible. Beyond the scope of the proposed development, this policy refers to the City’s promotion of alternative.
Policy 3.8.1: Preserve views of surrounding ridgelines, slope areas and hilltops, as well as other scenic vistas.	The proposed project would not block the views of any scenic resources available from the project site.
Policy 4.3.1: Ensure that noise-sensitive land uses and noise generators are located and designed in such a manner that City noise objectives will be achieved.	The proposed development meets the noise standards of the City’s General Plan as described in Section XIII. Additionally, mitigation measures/best management practices have been included to reduce construction and operational impacts to the greatest extent feasible.
Policy 4.5.1: Ensure that activities within the City of Lancaster transport, use, store, and dispose of hazardous materials in a responsible manner which protects the public health and safety.	The use of hazardous materials on the project site would be conducted in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations.
Policy 4.6.2: Ensure that the design of new development discourages opportunities for criminal activities to the maximum extent possible.	The project has been designed to ensure the safety and security of employees and visitors to the site.
Policy 4.7.2: Ensure that the design of new development minimizes the potential for fire.	The proposed project would be developed in accordance with all applicable fire code regulations. Additionally, fire hydrants would be installed both on/off site and the site is within the service boundaries of several fire stations.
Policy 14.1.1: Design the City’s street system to serve both the existing population and future residents.	The proposed project would improve both 15 th Street West and Avenue L to meet the requirements established by the City of Lancaster and ensure the safe operation of the transportation network.
Policy 14.1.4: Encourage the design of roads and traffic controls to optimize the safe traffic flow by minimizing turning movements, curb parking, uncontrolled access, and frequent stops.	Both 15 th Street West and Avenue L would be fully improved along the project frontage to meet the amount of traffic utilizing these roadways. Conditions of approval have been included to ensure the smooth operation of the roadway network. Additionally, the project would provide adequate parking on the project site.
Policy 14.2.2: Manage the City’s roadway network so that it is aesthetically pleasing through the development and maintenance of streetscapes.	The proposed project would install landscaping throughout the project site and along the project frontage to ensure a visually pleasing appearance. Additionally, both 15 th Street West and Avenue L

	would be improved to have a meandering sidewalk along the project frontage.
Policy 15.1.2: Cooperate with local water agencies to provide an adequate water supply system to meet the standards for domestic and emergency needs.	The proposed project would obtain its water from the White Fence Farms Mutual Water Company upon completion of all required improvements.
Policy 16.3.1: Promote development patterns which will minimize the costs of infrastructure development, public facilities development and municipal service cost delivery.	The project site is located within an area that is designated for a mix of land uses including commercial, residential, and medical and has the appropriate infrastructure to support those uses.
Policy 18.2.2: Encourage appropriate development to locate so that municipal services can be efficiently provided.	The project site is located within an area that is designated for a mix of residential, commercial, and medical land uses and has the appropriate infrastructure to support those uses or the infrastructure can be provided.

In addition to the City’s General Plan, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) adopts a Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) every five years. In April 2024, SCAG adopted by 2025-2050 RPT/SCS, known as Connect SoCal 2024. The RTP/SCS identifies regional goals/policies. These policies apply to the SCAG region as a whole and regionally significant developments. Many policies are not meant to apply to individual smaller projects. However, the goal of these policies are to improve the transportation network and goods movement, preserve natural habitat and agricultural lands, improve quantity and access to housing, and reduce GHG/increase climate resiliency. To the extent applicable, the proposed project achieves these goals. The proposed development would increase the amount of housing provided by developing 181 multi-family residential units as part of an overall mixed-use development in the central portion of the City. The project site is surrounded by a mix of land uses including residential (both single and multi-family), commercial, medical and park. The project site is highly disturbed and while it does contain Joshua trees and provide habitat for wildlife species, it is not connected to other habitat areas. As such, the project is generally consistent with Connect SoCal 2024.

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

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

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

a-b. The City’s General Plan (Table 3-1) establishes an outdoor maximum CNEL of 65 dBA for residential uses and 70 dBA for commercial uses. Table 8-11 of the LMEA provides the existing roadway noise levels adjacent to the project site. The current noise level on Avenue L between 15th Street West and 10th Street West is 70.1 dBA. The City’s municipal code limits construction noise to no more than 15 dBA above ambient for a single event noise levels. In this case, the maximum noise level off-site during construction is 85 dBA.

Project construction would occur in five phases: site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and finishing. Construction activities associated with earth moving equipment and other construction machinery would temporarily increase noise levels for surrounding land uses. Noise sensitive receptors are located in close proximity to the project site including the residential uses to the south and west and construction noise may be audible at these locations. However, all construction activities would occur in accordance with the City’s noise ordinance with respect to days of the week and time of day and would be temporary. A detailed noise study for construction and operational activities shall be prepared as part of the building permit process. The noise study shall include short- and long-term noise readings and be utilized to design the buildings and construction operations to minimize any impacts to neighboring residents. Additionally, construction best management practices have been identified to reduce the noise generated by construction activities and are applicable to all projects. With incorporation of these measures, construction noise may still be audible but would not exceed established standards and impacts would be less than significant.

The current noise level on Avenue L between 15th Street West and 10th Street West is 70.1 dBA. This noise level is consistent with the proposed mixed-use zoning and development for the project site. Per the VMT study prepared for the proposed project, the net traffic generated by the proposed development would be 3,656 trips. While traffic does generate noise, the traffic volumes on a roadway would need to double in order to be perceptible to neighboring uses. Avenue L and the State Route 14 have high traffic volumes and the addition of 3,656 trips would not double this volume. Additionally, while this noise level is consistent the standards of the General Plan, additional features of the proposed project (e.g., landscaping, block walls, building code requirements, etc.) would ensure that the project remains in compliance with the General Plan. Therefore, the potential noise impacts associated with traffic from the proposed development would be less than significant.

Operational noise from the proposed development, particularly the hotel and potential loading dock activities could generate noise levels in excess of standards for the neighboring residential properties if the uses are not designed appropriately. To ensure that all operational noise levels are consistent with the standards of the municipal code and General Plan, the applicant shall prepare a detailed noise study as described above and in the mitigation measure below. All recommendations of the noise study shall be incorporated into the design of the project prior to the issuance of any construction related permits. With incorporation of the identified mitigation measure, impacts associated with operation would be less than significant.

Construction activities can produce vibration that may be felt by adjacent land uses. The construction of the proposed project may require the use of equipment such as pile drivers, in the event that underground parking garages for the multi-family buildings and hotel are constructed. In order to ensure that vibration caused by construction equipment does not reach levels which could impact neighboring properties or cause damage to adjacent structures, a vibration analysis shall be included with the noise study and submitted with grading /construction plans which documents the expected vibration levels and identifies appropriate management strategies. All recommendations contained in the report shall be followed. With incorporation of the mitigation measure, impacts from vibration would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures/Best Management Practices

22. Prior to the submittal of any grading and/or building permits, the applicant shall have a construction and operational noise study prepared which identifies the existing /future noise and any necessary design features to ensure that noise levels adjacent residences do not exceed 65 dBA during construction or operation. Specifically, the noise study shall include:
 - a. Short- and long-term noise readings at the adjacent residential uses and on the project site.
 - b. Identification of location and material of any necessary noise barriers to be utilized during construction.
 - c. Any design features to be incorporated into the hotel and apartment buildings to ensure operations of these facilities do not exceed the noise standards established by the general plan.
 - d. A vibration noise analysis which identifies appropriate mitigation/management strategies to prevent impacts to neighboring residential properties and damage of structures based on the construction type and any subterranean parking.

This information shall be contained within a stand alone document and all recommendations and measures identified in the report shall be followed. Additionally, the measures shall be indicated on all construction and grading plans.

23. Construction operations shall not occur between 8 p.m. and 7 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday or at any time on Sunday. The hours of any construction-related activities shall be restricted to periods and days permitted by local ordinance.
 24. The on-site construction supervisor shall have the responsibility and authority to receive and resolve noise complaints. A clear appeal process to the owner shall be established prior to construction commencement that will allow for resolution of noise problems that cannot be immediately solved by the site supervisor.
 25. Electrically powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, where feasible.
 26. Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking and maintenance areas shall be located as far away as practicable from noise-sensitive receptors.
 27. No project-related public address or music system shall be audible at any adjacent receptor.
 28. All noise producing construction equipment and vehicles using internal combustion engines shall be equipped with mufflers, air-inlet silencers where appropriate, and any other shrouds, shields, or other noise-reducing features in good operating condition that meet or exceed original factor specifications. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors, etc.) shall be equipped with shrouds and noise control features that are readily available for the type of equipment.
- c. The project site is not located within two miles of an airport or within the boundaries of an airport land use plan. The nearest airfield, Air Force Plant 42, is located approximately 2.5 miles to the southeast of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose residents to a safety hazard or noise associated with an airport. 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 due to the inclusion of 181 multi-family residential units in the development. Additionally, the proposed project would provide new jobs associated with the hotel, management of the residential buildings, and employees of the tenants in the restaurant/retail buildings. It is expected that these positions would be filled by current residents of the Antelope Valley. Additionally, while it is likely that individuals involved in the construction of the proposed project, working at the development, or residential in the new apartments would come from the Antelope Valley, it is possible that individuals could relocate to the Antelope Valley as a result of the development. However, while any increase in population would contribute, on an incremental basis, to the population of the City, the increase would fall within the population projections identified in both the City’s General Plan and the SCAG’s projections. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

The City’s current RHNA number is 9,023 for the 2021-2029 Housing Element Cycle. The 181 multi-family residential units are anticipated to be market rate as the City does not have a requirement specifying that every residential development contain a certain number of affordable housing units. The project site is not identified in the City’s Housing Element as a site that was counted towards meeting the City’s affordable housing RHNA numbers or as a potential site for affordable housing. The residential units proposed as part of the project would count towards the City’s moderate and/or above moderate RHNA numbers. Additionally, the City continually supports the development of housing, both market and affordable, with over 1,000 residential units obtaining certificates of occupancy last year. Of these units, 461 were affordable with additional affordable units currently under construction.

A discussion of the State’s No Net Loss Law can be found in Section XI, Land Use and Planning.

b. The project site is currently vacant. No housing or people would be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

- a. The proposed project would increase the need for fire and police services during construction and operation of the development; 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 Fire Department reviews projects during the entitlement phase and sets the requirements for public and private fire hydrants. For the proposed project, three public fire hydrants with a required fire flow of 3,625 gallons per minute (GPM) at 20 psi for three hours is required. Five on-site private hydrants are required with each hydrant having a minimum fire flow of 1,250 gpm at 20 psi for two hours and a combined fire flow of 2,500 gpm at 20 psi for two hours. The requirements are part of the conditions of approval for the project. The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth and therefore, would not increase the demand on parks or other public facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

a-b. The proposed project may generate additional population growth through the creation of new jobs and would contribute on an incremental basis to the use of the existing park and recreational facilities. The proposed project does not involve the construction of any parks; however, it does include recreational amenities (e.g., outdoor pools, etc.) as part of the multi-family residential buildings and club house. However, the applicant would be required to pay applicable park fees which would offset the impacts to the existing parks. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

- a. The proposed project would not conflict with any programs, plans, ordinances and policies with respect to transportation systems including bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The project site is located at the southeast corner of Avenue L and 15th Street West, and adjacent to the Antelope Valley Freeway. Additionally, sidewalks would be installed along the Avenue L and 15th Street West project frontages and the development would provide bicycle facilities in accordance with the California Green Building Code. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- b. In July 2020, the City of Lancaster adopted standards and thresholds for analyzing projects with respect to vehicle miles traveled (VMT). A series of 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 Vehicle Miles Traveled Mitigation program was created to assist developers in mitigating their vehicle miles traveled to 15% below the Antelope Valley Planning Area (AVPA) baseline (City’s adopted threshold). The City Council approved the program on January 24, 2023, the second reading was held on February 14, 2023, and the program went into effect on March 14, 2023. As part of the development of the program a nexus study was prepared and a Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2021090175) was certified along with a Statement of Overriding Considerations. The program went into effect on March 14, 2023 and is codified in Chapter 15.67 of the Lancaster Municipal Code.

The program was developed utilizing a list of unfunded, planned infrastructure projects identified within many existing planning documents. The identified infrastructure projects which could directly contribute

toward reducing Citywide VMT and could be funded by the program include, but are not limited to, new and widened sidewalks, medians, multipurpose paths, crosswalks, pedestrian refuge islands, curb pop-outs, flashing beacons, a variety of traffic calming measures (speed humps), traffic circles, etc. These potential improvements were quantified and an overall construction cost was estimated. Based on this information, the nexus study determined that a fee of up to \$400 per could be charged.

The adopted fee of \$150.00 per VMT was based on the nexus study and feedback from the development community. The fee does not apply to all development within the City. The fee only applies to development projects that do not screen out of a VMT analysis and have a VMT impact. Developers are not obliged to utilize the program if they choose to mitigate the VMT impacts through other means (e.g., choosing to install additional improvements beyond the requirements of the project, etc.); however, all projects with VMT impacts are required to reduce them to 15% below the City's threshold. Payment of the fee is required prior to the issuance of any constructed-related permits.

Mixed-use developments are analyzed for VMT on their individual components. As such, the 12,800 square feet of restaurant/retail space screens out of a VMT analysis under Criteria 2 – commercial developments of 50,000 square feet or smaller. The multi-family residences (181 units) and the 235-room hotel did not screen out of a VMT analysis and required the preparation of a VMT analysis to determine how much, if any, the VMT generated needs to be reduced to be at least 15% below the City's adopted thresholds.

A vehicle miles traveled analysis was conducted for the hotel and multi-family residential uses associated with the proposed development by Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning. The results of the analysis are documented in a report entitled "Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis, West Lancaster Mixed Use Development SEC of 15th Street West & Avenue L, Lancaster, California" and dated January 27, 2025. The VMT analysis determined that the VMT associated with the 181 multi-family residential units was already more than 15% below the AVPA baseline while the hotel VMT needed to reduce its VMT by 185.7 VMT to meet the threshold. The VMT mitigation program allows developers to pay \$150 per VMT to mitigate their VMT impacts and tier off of the Program EIR. The proposed project will be required to participate in the VMT Mitigation Program in accordance with the mitigation measure below. Upon payment of the required fee, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

29. In accordance with the City of Lancaster's Vehicle Miles Traveled Impact Fee Mitigation Program, the applicant shall pay a total of \$27,855 to reduce VMT impacts prior to the issuance of any construction-related permits.
- c. The proposed project would be accessed from two driveways on 15th Street West. No driveways would be provided directly onto Avenue L. The proposed project would be required to make additional improvements to Avenue L and to pave and do additional improvements to 15th Street West along the project frontage. The intersection of 15th Street West and Avenue L is signalized and the project would be required to make modifications to the signal timing to account for the additional traffic. These improvements would ensure the smooth and efficient operation of the surrounding roadways would not increase any hazard in the vicinity of the project nor create dangerous design situations. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- d. The project site would be accessed from two driveways on 15th Street West which would provide adequate emergency access. Drive aisles within the project site would be design to the standards

required by the Los Angeles County Fire Department, ensuring adequate emergency access to all areas of the site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. <u>TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> . 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. The remains of an historic period site are located on the project site; however, no prehistoric resources were identified during the survey. Additionally, no specific tribal cultural resources were identified during the AB 52 / SB 18 process; however, the YSMN, FTBMI and MBMI responded and requested that specific mitigation measures be included to address treatment of previously unknown cultural resources, worker education/training, and tribal monitoring. These mitigation measures have been included in the cultural resources section. As such, no impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources would occur.

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

- a. The proposed project would be required to connect to the existing utilities such as electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, telecommunications, etc. These services already exist in the vicinity of the project site, specifically along Avenue L. 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 White Fence Farms Mutual Water Company has not indicated any problems in supplying water to the proposed project from existing facilities upon completion of the company’s requirements. No new construction of water treatment or new or expanded entitlements would be required. Therefore, water impacts would be less than significant.

- c. The project site would receive service from the Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 14 upon annexation. All wastewater would be treated at the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant which has a design capacity of 18 million gallons per day (mgd) and currently produces an average recycled water flow of 13.9 mgd. The proposed project would discharge to a local sewer line(s) maintained by the City of Lancaster for conveyance to a District Trunk Sewer. The project is required to install a local mainline sewer in 15th Street West and all permanent structures on the site are required to have individual laterals in accordance with City standards. The proposed project would not require the expansion of existing facilities or the construction of new facilities, such as the wastewater treatment plant. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- d-e. Solid waste generated within the City limits is generally disposed of at the Lancaster Landfill located at 600 East Avenue F, which is permitted to allow a daily throughput of 3,000 tons. This landfill is a Class III landfill which accepts agricultural, nonfriable asbestos construction/demolition waste, contaminated soil, green materials, industrial, inert, mixed municipal, sludge, and waste tires. It does not accept hazardous materials. Assembly Bill (AB) 939 was adopted in 1989 and required a 25% diversion of solid waste from landfills by 1995 and a 50% diversion by 2025. In 2011, AB 341 was passed which required the State to achieve a 75% reduction in solid waste by 2030. The City of Lancaster also requires all developments to have trash collection services in accordance with City contracts with waste haulers over the life of the proposed project. These collection services would also collect recyclable materials and organics. The trash haulers are required to be in compliance with applicable regulations on solid waste transport and disposal, including waste stream reduction mandated under AB 341.

The proposed project would generate solid waste during construction and operation, which would contribute to an overall impact on landfill 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, impacts 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. Per the State Fire Hazard Severity Zones Map (dated September 29, 2023 and effective April 1, 2024) managed by the State Fire Marshall, the project site is not located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. The closest area designated as being in a fire severity zone is located in the foothills between Rancho Vista Blvd and Elizabeth Lake Road at approximately 50th Street West. This is between 3.5 and 4 miles southwest of the project site with a lot of development in between. The project site is located within the service boundaries of Fire Station No. 134, located at 43225 25th Street West, approximately 1 mile northwest of the project site, which would provide service in the event of a fire. Additionally, the proposed project would be constructed in accordance with all existing and applicable building and fire codes. Therefore, no impacts would occur as a result of wildfires.

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

a-c. The proposed project consists of the construction and operation/occupancy of a mixed-used development consisting of 181 multi-family residential units, a 235-room hotel with associated clubhouse, and 12,800 square feet of restaurant/retail space on approximately 10 acres at the southeast corner of Avenue L and 15th Street West. In order to facilitate the proposed project, tentative tract map, general plan amendment and zone change have been requested. The tentative tract map would subdivide the subject property into 6 lots: one for each building and/or land use. The general plan amendment and zone change would change the designation and zoning of the subject property to C (Commercial) and CPD (Commercial Planned Development), respectively. Other projects have been approved or are under review within approximately one mile of the project site including those identified in Table 7. These projects are also required to be in accordance with the City’s zoning code and General Plan. Cumulative impacts are the change in the environment, which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects.

The proposed project would not create any impacts with respect to Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Mineral Resources, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Wildfire. The project would create impacts to other resource areas and mitigation measures have been identified for Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Noise, and Transportation. Impacts associated with these issues would be less than significant with the incorporation of the identified mitigation measures. Many of the impacts generated by projects are site specific and generally do not influence the impacts on another site. All projects undergo environmental review and require mitigation measures to reduce impacts when warranted. These mitigation measures reduce environmental impacts to less than significant levels whenever possible. Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

**Table 11
Related Projects List**

Case No.	Location	APNs	Acres	Description	Status
SPR 22-008	Corner of Ave L-8 & 12 th St W	3109-025-049	2.11	New light industrial building/warehouse	Under Review
SPR 21-016	Ave L-12 & 11 th St W	3109-024-043	1.14	Industrial Buildings	Approved
SPR 22-001	20 th St W & Ave K	3129-016-066	3.8	Self Storage	Under Construction
SPR 23-001	Ave L and 22 nd St W	3109-017-071	1.87	Self Storage	Approved
CUP 19-012	SEC of 10 th St W & Ave K-8	3128-004-016	4.43	3,360 sf mini-mart; 3,825 sf gas island; 4 commercial/retail buildings totaling 24,715 sf	Under construction
SPR 21-005	NWC 10 th St W & Ave L-8	3109-025-051	2.42	4 industrial buildings totaling 37,000 sf	Approved
SPR 22-011	Market/Forbes/Enterprise /Ave L-8	3128-008-009	11.83	233,600 square foot industrial distribution facility	Approved
SPR 23-014	8 th St W & Ave L-8	3128-009-089, -104	4.43	92,528 square foot industrial building	Approved
CUP 23-020	SWC of 10 th St W and Ave L	3109-026-047, -048, -049	3.72	Carwash, fast-food restaurant, EV charging facility	Approved
Parkway Village Specific Plan	AveK, Ave L, Sierra Highway, 10 th St W/Gadsden		435	4,246 residential units; 130 hotel rooms; 335,000 sf commercial; 415 sf office, medical office and uses supportive of offices; transit hub; school uses, parks, 200 bed hospital and 500,000 sf of associated support facilities	Under Preparation

List of Referenced Documents and Available Locations*:

AIR:	Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis Report for a 10.126 Acre Commercial Project Development in City of Lancaster, California, Metropolis Architecture, Inc., August 15, 2024	CDD
BRR:	Biological Resources Report on APN 3109-026-32, 40, 42, 44, 9 Acres, SEC Avenue L and 15 th Street West, Lancaster, California, Callyn D. Yorke, PhD, May 2023	CDD
CRS:	Updated Phase I Cultural Resource Investigation for 15 th Street West And Avenue L Commercial Project, 9.5 Acres Southeast of the Intersection of 15 th Street West and Avenue L, Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California, RT Factfinders Cultural Resources, January 2021	CDD
ESA:	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Proposed Commercial Property 1340 West Avenue L, APNs: 3109-026-32, -40, -42, -44 (Approximately 10 Acres), Lancaster, California, Krazan & Associates, Inc., November 25, 2020	CDD
FIRM:	Flood Insurance Rate Map	CDD
GPEIR:	Lancaster General Plan Environmental Impact Report	CDD
LGP:	Lancaster General Plan	CDD
LMC:	Lancaster Municipal Code	CDD
LMEA:	Lancaster Master Environmental Assessment	CDD
SSHZ:	State Seismic Hazard Zone Maps	CDD
USGS:	United States Geological Survey Maps	CDD
USDA SCS:	United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Maps	CDD
VMT:	Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) Analysis West Lancaster Mixed Use Development, SEC of 15 th Street West & Avenue L, Lancaster, California, Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning, January 27, 2025	CDD

* CDD: Community Development Department
 Planning and Permitting Division
 Lancaster City Hall
 44933 Fern Avenue
 Lancaster, California 93534