

**AGENDA ITEM:** 3.

**DATE:** 01-19-10

**STAFF REPORT**

**TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 66115**

**DATE:** January 19, 2010  
**TO:** Lancaster Planning Commission  
**FROM:** Planning Department  
**APPLICANT:** Carlo Bondanelli  
**LOCATION:** 49.15± gross acres located on the southeast corner of future Avenue L-4 and future 5th Street West  
**REQUEST:** A subdivision for 45 Industrial lots in the LI (Light Industrial) Zone

RECOMMENDATION: Adopt Resolution No. 09-36 approving Tentative Parcel Map No. 66115.

BACKGROUND: On December 21, 2009, the Planning Commission continued TPM 66115 to the January 19, 2010, Planning Commission meeting in order to allow the Planning Commissioners adequate time to review the environmental documents and the Initial Study. Staff has provided the Commissioners with the reports in addition to comments received from the Department of Fish and Game.

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION, EXISTING ZONING, AND LAND USE: The subject property is designated as LI (Light Industrial) by the General Plan, is zoned LI (Light Industrial), and is currently vacant. The General Plan designation, zoning, and land use of the surrounding properties are as follows:

	<u>GENERAL PLAN</u>	<u>ZONING</u>	<u>LAND USE</u>
NORTH	LI	LI	Vacant
EAST	LI	LI	Vacant
SOUTH	LI	LI	Vacant
WEST	LI	LI	Vacant

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS: The site is bounded on the north by future Avenue L-4, on the south by future Avenue L-8, and on the west by future 5<sup>th</sup> Street West, which are undeveloped. All public utilities are available or can be extended to serve the site.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: Review of pertinent environmental documents has disclosed no significant adverse impacts resulting from the proposed subdivision after mitigation measures have been applied. Potential effects are discussed more fully in the attached Initial Study. The Initial Study prepared for the proposed project was sent to the State Clearinghouse SCH # 2009111071 for public review. This 30-day public review period ended on December 21, 2009. Based on this information, staff has determined that a mitigated Negative Declaration is warranted. Notice of intent to prepare a mitigated Negative Declaration has been legally advertised.

Effective January 1, 1991, applicants whose projects have the potential to result in the loss of fish, wildlife, or habitat through urbanization and/or land use conversion are required to pay filing fees as set forth under Section 711.4 of the Fish and Game Code. Pursuant to Section 21089(b) of the Public Resources Code, the approval of a project is not valid, and no development right is vested, until such fees are paid.

LEGAL NOTICE: Notice of Public Hearing was mailed to all property owners within a 500-foot radius of the project, posted in three places, posted on the subject property, and noticed in a newspaper of general circulation per prescribed procedure.

ANALYSIS: The proposed subdivision consists of 45 Industrial lots in the LI Zone. The lots would range in size from approximately 21,816 square feet to 51,960 square feet, and be developed in three phases. Phase 1A will consist of 10 lots, Phase 1B will consist of 6 lots, and Phase 2 will consist of 29 lots in the LI Zone. Future development of each lot would require a separate application and environmental review. The project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation of Light Industrial. Division of the property would allow for development of 45 Industrial building at a future date. No construction is being proposed as part of the subdivision. The proposed project site is vacant.

The proposed subdivision would have access from 5<sup>th</sup> Street West, Avenue L-4, Avenue L-8 and Enterprise Parkway, all via Sierra Highway. In order to provide continuity, street improvements would be required in 5<sup>th</sup> Street West, Avenue L-4, Avenue L-8 and Enterprise Parkway. Avenue L-4 east of Street "C", and Enterprise Parkway would be developed with Phase 1A. Avenue L-8 east of Lot 9 would be developed with Phase 1B. Avenue L-4 west of Street "C", Avenue L-8 west of Lot 9, and, 5<sup>th</sup> Street West would be developed with Phase 2. Individual lot access would be provided from a series of internal streets. The proposed subdivision has the potential to generate 3,102 vehicular trips per day, with 388 trips occurring during the peak hours, which would not significantly impact surrounding streets once improvements have been implemented. Adequate drainage facilities and improvements would be provided for the subdivision.

A biological resources survey was conducted for the proposed project by Circle Mountain Biological Consultants on January 4 and 5, 2006. The study area was characteristic of shrub community,

which defies clear characterization; it is neither saltbush scrub nor creosote bush scrub, although it has aspects of both communities. A project survey was conducted to determine if desert tortoise, Mohave ground squirrel, burrowing owls, and other sensitive plant and animal species or their sign were present on the project site. The project site is within the range of Mohave Ground squirrel, and habitat on the site is suitable for Mohave ground squirrels. In addition, the project site contains suitable habitat for burrowing owls, but no burrowing owls were detected on the project site during the survey. An active burrow with fresh pellets and whitewash was found on the western bank of the Amargosa Creek and a single burrowing owl pellet was found about 100 feet north of the project site. Vegetation that is suitable for nesting birds was also found on the project site. Therefore, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

In addition, the site contains a small stream course that runs near the center of the site. Development of the proposed lots could potentially impact this resource. Therefore, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

A cultural resources survey of the project site was conducted by Groark Historical Consulting on December 25 and 26, 2005. As a result, it was noted that much of the property site was covered by a scattering of windblown cans with depositional loci and construction refuse located at the bottom of a shallow wash. The materials found date back to the mid 1950s through the mid 1970s. Based on an assessment of the materials found on the site, the site does not qualify as significant under CEQA and therefore, are not considered significant and impacts would be less than significant.

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for the proposed project by Earth Systems Southern California on December 29, 2005. The site consists of vacant undeveloped land that is vegetated with native desert weeds and grasses. No hazardous materials were observed to be used, stored, or disposed of on the subject site.

In addition to the site visit, a regulatory database search was conducted on the project site and the immediately surrounding area (up to one mile radius) by EDR, and dated December 21, 2005. The subject property and adjoining parcels were not identified as having hazardous materials use, storage, or release sites within a one-mile radius. However, thirty-four hazardous materials use, storage, or release sites were identified within a one-mile radius of the subject property. Eight of those sites have had a reported spill or release of hazardous materials. However, of those eight, five have received regulatory agency closure. The remaining three sites are located between .3 and .7 miles from the property site, and involve hydrocarbon (fuel) contamination. Open fuel leak sites that are located within 250-feet in the upgradient direction are considered to have potential risk to the subsurface soils and/or groundwater of the property. No open fuel leak sites were identified within .3 miles of the property. No environmental concerns for the property were noted, and no potential off-site sources of contamination were identified within a 1 mile radius. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

The subdivision is consistent with the General Plan designation of Light Industrial; the proposed subdivision meets the City's zoning requirements for the LI Zone; and sufficient access, utilities, and

PC Staff Report  
Tentative Parcel Map No. 66115  
January 19, 2010  
Page 4

infrastructure exist or can be extended to serve the project site. Therefore, staff is recommending that the Commission approve Tentative Parcel Map No. 66115.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Randie Davis, Assistant Planner

cc: Applicant  
Engineer

## RESOLUTION NO. 09-36

### A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 66115

WHEREAS, a tentative parcel map has been filed by Carlo Bondanelli for the division of 49.15± gross acres located on the southeast corner of future Avenue L-4 and future 5th Street West, as shown on the attached site map, into four lots; and

WHEREAS, staff has conducted necessary investigations to assure the proposed division of land would be consistent with the purposes of the City's Subdivision Ordinance, the State Subdivision Map Act, and the regulations of the Light Industrial Zone; and

WHEREAS, a written report was prepared by staff, which included a recommendation for approval of this tentative parcel map subject to conditions; and

WHEREAS, public notice was provided as required by law and a public hearing was held on January 19, 2010; and

WHEREAS, the initial study was performed for this project in accordance with the requirements of CEQA; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby finds that the Initial Study determined that the proposed subdivision could have a significant effect on the environment; however, there would not be a significant effect in this case with the implementation of mitigation measures as detailed in Exhibit "A"; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby finds, pursuant to Section 21082.1 of the Public Resources Code, that the mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed project reflects the independent judgment of the City of Lancaster; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby adopts the following findings in support of approval of this map:

1. The site is physically suitable for the type and proposed density of development because adequate roadway capacity and infrastructure exist or can be provided, and the site has no topographical constraints.
2. The design and improvement of the subdivision are not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat because the site is not within a sensitive habitat area, and all potential impacts are reduced to a level of less than significance with mitigation measure as noted in the environmental review section of the staff report.

3. The design and improvement of the subdivision are not likely to cause serious public health problems, because adequate sewer and water systems would be provided to the project.
4. The design and improvement of the subdivision would not conflict with easements acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision because all such easements have been incorporated into the proposed public streets (or will be abandoned), based on staff review of a preliminary title report.
5. The proposed subdivision provides, to the extent feasible, for the future passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities in the subdivision because the size and configuration of the parcels would allow for such systems, and

WHEREAS, this Commission, after considering all evidence presented, further finds that approval of the proposed tentative subdivision map will promote the orderly growth and development of the City.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

This Commission hereby approves Tentative Parcel Map No. 66115, subject to the conditions attached hereto and incorporated herein.

PASSED, APPROVED and ADOPTED this 19<sup>th</sup> day of January 2010, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

---

JAMES D. VOSE, Chairman  
Lancaster Planning Commission

ATTEST:

---

BRIAN S. LUDICKE, Planning Director  
City of Lancaster

**ATTACHMENT TO PC RESOLUTION NO. 09-36**  
**TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 66115**  
**CONDITIONS LIST**  
**January 19, 2010**

**GENERAL/ADVISORY**

1. All standard conditions as set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 06-12 shall apply, except Condition No. 13, 19, 24, 25, 30, 34, 36, 51, 56, 58, 59, 60 (modified), and 62.

**STREETS**

2. Per the direction of the Public Works Director, improve and offer for dedication:
  - 5<sup>th</sup> Street West, at 68 feet of an ultimate 80-foot right-of-way
  - Avenue L-8, at 68 feet of an ultimate 80-foot right-of-way
  - Avenue L-4, at 60 feet of an ultimate 80-foot right-of-way
  - Enterprise Parkway at a 80-foot right-of-way
  - Street “A” at a 80-foot right-of-way
  - Street “B” at a 80-foot right-of-way
  - Street “C” at a 80-foot right-of-way

**ENVIRONMENTAL**

3. Per the direction of the Public Works Director, prior to issuance of a grading permit, a burrowing owl survey shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities. If burrowing owls or their sign are observed on the project site, then protocol burrowing owl surveys shall be required in accordance with established California Department of Fish and Game procedures.
4. Per the direction of the Planning Director, a nesting bird survey shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities. If nesting birds are encountered, all work in the area shall cease until either the young birds have fledged or the appropriate permits are obtained from the California Department of Fish and Game.
5. Focused trapping surveys for Mohave ground squirrel shall be conducted to determine the presence/absence of this species on the project site. These surveys shall be conducted in accordance with standard protocol established by CDFG. If Mohave ground squirrels are determined to be present on the project site, consultation with CDFG shall be required in order to obtain an Incidental Take Permit under §2081 of the CDFG Code.
6. The applicant shall consult with the California Department of Fish and Game to determine whether or not a Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement is required prior to the

development of the project site. If a Streambed Alteration Agreement is required, it shall be obtained prior to the issuance of any permits (e.g., grading, etc.).

7. The applicant shall coordinate with the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board to determine whether the applicant is required to obtain a Report of Waste Discharge prior to the development of the project site. If this permit is required, it shall be obtained prior to the issuance of any permits (e.g., grading, etc.).

### **OTHER CONDITIONS**

8. Per the direction of the Director of Public Works, all street lighting systems designed after July 1, 2007, shall be designed as City owned and maintained street lighting systems. The Developer's engineer shall prepare all plans necessary to build said street lighting system in accordance with Southern California Edison and City of Lancaster standards.
9. Per the direction of the Directors of Planning and Public Works, at the time of project construction, the applicant shall be required to comply with all Ordinances adopted to address the balance of water supply to water demand.
10. Contact Los Angeles County Waterworks District to determine if there are any additional off-site improvements or conditions that would be required. The proposed development will also be required to pay all applicable Waterworks District fees.
11. The development shall comply with all requirements of Ordinance No. 907 (Water Efficient Landscaping Requirements).
12. Prior to grading, the applicant shall provide 24 hours, 7 days a week, a contact name and valid phone number regarding blowing dust or debris from the site.
13. Per the direction of the Planning Director, all individual site development shall comply with the adopted City of Lancaster's Design Guideline Manual, including both site layout and building design/elevations. In the event disputes arise between the applicant and the Planning Director regarding elevations, or design of the buildings, the matter may be appealed to the Architectural and Design Commission (ADC), and the ADC shall render the final decision.
14. Restrict access at the intersection of Avenue L-4 and Sierra Highway to right-turn entrance and right-turn exit only. A raised median on Sierra Highway would fulfill this condition effectively.
15. Restrict access at the intersection of Avenue L-8 and Sierra Highway to right-turn entrance and right-turn exit only. As indicated in the review dated March 31, 2008, this intersection



should be signalized to mitigate Phase I impacts. As an interim measure, the installation of surface mounted channelizers and appropriate signing would suffice under Phase IA.

16. Contribute to the cost of installing traffic signals at both northbound and southbound ramps of State Route 14 at Avenue M (Columbia Way) as determined by the Director of Public Works. This project is pending addition to the City's capital program, subject to ongoing joint design and funding arrangements with CalTrans, the County of Los Angeles and the City of Palmdale. The project's payment of traffic signal fees could serve as sufficient mitigation of its significant traffic impacts at these locations.

Mit. / Cond. No.	Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval	Monitoring Milestone (Frequency)	Method of Verification	Party Responsible for Monitoring	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>							
1.	A burrowing owl survey shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities. If burrowing owls or their sign are observed on the project site, then protocol burrowing owl surveys shall be required in accordance with established California Department of Fish and Game procedures.	Prior to vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpile, or construction the City must receive a report from a biologist advising site free from burrowing owls.	Prior to final approval of grading plan, issuance of a stockpile permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	Planning Department			
2.	A nesting bird survey shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities. If nesting birds are encountered all work in the area shall cease until either the young birds have fledged or the appropriate permits are obtained from the California Department of Fish and Game.	Prior to vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpile, or construction the City must receive a report from a biologist advising site free from nesting birds.	Prior to final approval of grading plan, issuance of a stockpile permit or any ground disturbing activities.	Planning Department			
3.	Focused trapping surveys for Mohave ground squirrel shall be conducted by a CDFG approved biologist to determine the presence/absence of this species on the project site. These surveys shall be conducted in accordance with standard protocol established by CDFG. If Mohave ground squirrels are determined to be present on the project site, consultation with CDFG shall be required in order to obtain an Incidental Take Permit under §2081 of the CDFG Code	Prior to vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpile, or construction the City must receive a report from a CDFG approved biologist determining the presence/absence of Mohave ground squirrels.	Prior to final approval of grading plan, issuance of a stockpile permit or any ground disturbing activities.	Planning Department/ Engineering responsible for reviewing report.			
4.	The applicant shall consult with the California Department of Fish and Game to determine whether or not a Section 1602 Streambed alteration Agreement is required prior to construction (grading/vegetation removal) activities. If a Streambed Alteration Agreement is required, it shall be obtained prior to the	Prior to vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpile, or construction the City must receive a notification from the	Prior to final approval of grading plan, issuance of a stockpile permit or any ground disturbing activities.	Planning Department/ Engineering responsible for reviewing report.			

Mit. / Cond. No.	Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval	Monitoring Milestone (Frequency)	Method of Verification	Party Responsible for Monitoring	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	issuance of any permits (e.g., grading, stockpiling, etc.).	CDFG.					
5.	The applicant shall coordinate with the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board to determine whether the applicant is required to obtain a Report of Waste Discharge prior to construction (grading/vegetation removal) activities. If this permit is required, it shall be obtained prior to the issuance of any permit (e.g., grading, stockpiling, etc.).	Prior to vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpile, or construction the City must receive a notification from the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board.	Prior to final approval of grading plan, issuance of a stockpile permit or any ground disturbing activities.	Planning Department/ Engineering responsible for reviewing report.			

CITY OF LANCASTER  
INITIAL STUDY

1. Project title and File Number: Tentative Parcel Map No. 66115
2. Lead agency name and address: City of Lancaster  
Planning Department  
44933 Fern Avenue  
Lancaster, California 93934
3. Contact person and phone number: Randie Davis  
(661) 723-6100
4. Applicant name and address: Carlo Bondanelli  
6380 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90048  
323-655-9465
5. Location: 49.15 gross acres located on the southeast corner of future Avenue L-4 and future 5th Street West.
6. General Plan designation: LI (Light Industrial)
7. Zoning: LI (Light Industrial)
8. Description of project: The proposed project consists of a subdivision for 45 industrial lots. These lots will be developed at a future date. When development occurs, it will be phased in three separate phases: Phase IA (10 lots), Phase IB (6 lots), and Phase 2 (29 lots). At the time of development, the required improvements, including streets and street lights would be installed. Future development of each lot would require a separate application and environmental review.
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: The project site is vacant. The General Plan designation, zoning and land use of the surrounding properties are as follows. The property to the east and west is designated LI, zoned LI, and is vacant. The property to the north is designated LI, zoned LI, and is mostly vacant; however, industrial development exists along the northeastern portion of site. The property to the south is designated LI, zoned LI, and mostly vacant; however, industrial development exists along the eastern portion of the site. The Amargosa Creek is located approximately 240 feet west of the project site.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

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

- Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 (connection to the water system)
- Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (report of waste discharge)
- Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 14 (annexation/connection to public sewer)
- Los Angeles County Fire Department (fire access and life safety equipment)
- Southern California Edison (street lights)

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 Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils
<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 / Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems	<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 the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in a earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicant standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Randie Davis  
EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

\_\_\_\_\_  
November 17, 2009  
Date

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

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

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



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?				X
<b>III. AIR QUALITY</b> -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b> -- 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		
		Less	Less	

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

	Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation	Significant Impact	Impact
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

**DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

I. a. Views of scenic vistas are currently available from the roadways and area surrounding the project site as listed by the General Plan (LMEA Figure 12-1). The scenic vistas include views of Foothills Area (Scenic Area 1) and Quartz Hill (Scenic Area 3). Additionally, views of the open desert and mountains surrounding the valley are also available from the project site. The proposed project would involve the subdivision of the project site into 45 industrial lots. With implementation of the proposed project, the available views would not change and would continue to be available from the public streets. Therefore, no impacts to scenic vistas would occur as a result of the proposed project.

b. The project site consists of approximately 49.15 gross acres of vacant desert. The project site does not contain any buildings (historic or otherwise) or rock outcroppings. Additionally, the project site is not located along a State Scenic Highway. Therefore, the removal of any scenic resources

from the project site would not be a significant aesthetic impact and impacts would be less than significant.

c. The proposed project would create 45 industrial lots. As development on these lots occurs, it would change the visual character of the project site from a open desert to an industrial business park type setting. The character would be compatible with the other industrial uses in the area. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d. No lighting currently exists on the project site and minimal amounts of ambient lighting existing in the surrounding area. The proposed project would create 45 industrial lots. As development on these lots occurs, lighting would be introduced into the area in the form of street lights, building/security lighting, vehicle headlights, etc. This lighting would be similar to lighting generated by other industrial users in the area and would be directed onto the site. Glare would be generated from vehicle headlights, windshields and reflective surfaces on buildings. Impacts associated with light and glare would be less than significant as light would be directed downward onto the site and the use of reflective building materials would be minimized to the greatest extent possible. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

II. a-c. There is no evidence that the site has been previously used for agricultural production. The site is not identified as Prime or Unique Farmland, contains no Williamson Act Contract, and is not located in proximity to any existing agricultural operation. Therefore, the project would not have an impact on agricultural resources.

III. a. Development proposed under the City's General Plan would not create air emissions that exceed the Air Quality Management Plan (GPEIR p. 5.5-21-22). The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Code. Therefore, the project itself would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan and no impacts would occur.

b. The proposed project consists of the subdivision of the project site into 45 industrial lots. No construction activities are anticipated at this time; therefore, no air emissions would be generated. However, as each individual lot is developed, air emissions associated with grading, use of heavy equipment, construction worker vehicles, etc., would be generated. These emissions are anticipated to be less than significant due to the small size of each of the individual lots. Additionally, as development on each individual lot is proposed, it would be subject to its own environmental review which would ensure that air emissions remain below established thresholds.

The proposed project consists of the subdivision of the project site into 45 industrial lots. No specific development has been planned at this time; therefore, no vehicle emissions would occur. However, as development on the individual lots occurs, vehicle emissions would be generated. Phase IA is anticipated to generate 59 am peak hour trips and 66 pm peak hour trips. These trips would generate air emissions; however, the amount of traffic generated by the project is not sufficient to create or contribute considerably to violations of air quality standards. Therefore, emissions associated with the operation of Phase IA of the proposed project would be less than significant.

c. The project would, in conjunction with other development as allowed by the General Plan, result in a cumulative net increase of pollutants. However, since emissions associated with Phase IA of the proposed project are less than significant due to the small number of trips generated, its contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d. The closest sensitive receptor is a multi-family residential development located approximately ½ mile northwest of the project site. Based upon the amount of traffic expected to be generated by the proposed project, no significant traffic impacts would be anticipated. Therefore, substantial pollutant concentrations would not occur and impacts would be less than significant.

e. The proposed project is not anticipated to produce significant objectionable odors. However, as each lot is sold and developed construction equipment may generate some odors, but these odors would be similar to those produced by vehicles traveling on Sierra Highway. Most objectionable odors are typically associated with industrial project 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. Development of each of the individual lots may result in uses which could generate odors. However, all activities are required to be conducted within buildings and in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations. This would ensure that any potential odor impacts are less than significant.

IV. a. A biological resources survey was conducted for the proposed project by Circle Mountain Biological Consultants, and documented in a report entitled “Focused Survey for Desert Tortoise and Western Burrowing Owl, and Habitat Evaluation for Mohave Ground Squirrel on APN 3128-008-008, a 48-acre± Site in the City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California”, dated January 2006.

A survey of the project site was conducted on January 4 and 5, 2006. Most of the site is vegetated with a shrub community. The dominant perennial plants observed on-site included rubber rabbitbrush (*Chrysothamnus nauseosus*), Nevada jointfir (*Ephedra nevadensis*), Great Basin sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata*), cheesebush (*Hymenoclea salsola*), matchweed (*Gutierrezia* sp.), and four-winged saltbush (*Atriplex canescens*).

The project site is within the range of Mohave Ground squirrel and habitat on the site is suitable for Mohave ground squirrels. The project site contains suitable habitat for burrowing owls, but no burrowing owls were detected on the project site during the surveys. An active burrow with fresh pellets and whitewash was found on the western bank of the Amargosa Creek and a single burrowing owl pellet was found about 100 feet north of the project site. The site contains vegetation that is suitable for nesting birds. Therefore, in order to ensure that impacts to burrowing owls, Mohave ground squirrels, and nesting birds are less than significant, the following mitigation measures are required:

1. A burrowing owl survey shall be conducted with 30 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities. If burrowing owls or sign thereof are discovered during the survey, the applicant shall contact the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) to determine the appropriate mitigation/management requirements for the species.
2. A nesting bird survey shall be conducted with 30 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities. If nesting birds are encountered, all work in the area shall cease until either the young birds have fledged or the appropriate permits are obtained from the California Department of Fish and Game.
3. Focused trapping surveys for Mohave ground squirrel shall be conducted to determine the presence/absence of this species on the project site. These surveys shall be conducted in accordance with standard protocol established by CDFG. If Mohave ground squirrels are

determined to be present on the project site, consultation with CDFG shall be required in order to obtain an Incidental Take Permit under §2081 of the CDFG Code.

b. The site contains a small stream course that runs near the center of the site and has been used for debris dumping in the past. The stream course located on the site may be a California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) jurisdictional water. Additionally, the Regional Water Quality Control Board – Lahontan Region may choose to exert its jurisdiction over these waters pursuant to the Porter-Cologne Act. Development of the proposed project would eliminate the existing stream course. Therefore, construction of the proposed could potentially impact this resource. Therefore, the following mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

4. The applicant shall consult with the California Department of Fish and Game to determine whether or not a Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement is required prior to the development of the project site. If a Streambed Alteration Agreement is required, it shall be obtained prior to the issuance of any permits (e.g., grading, etc.).
5. The applicant shall coordinate with the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board to determine whether the applicant is required to obtain a Report of Waste Discharge prior to the development of the project site. If this permit is required, it shall be obtained prior to the issuance of any permits (e.g., grading, etc.).

c. There are no federally protected wetlands on the project site that fall under the provisions of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

d. The project site is not part of an established migratory wildlife corridor. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

e-f. The project site is not located within an area designated under an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan. Additionally, there are no local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources which are applicable to this site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

V. a-d. A cultural resources survey was conducted for the project site by Groark Historical Consulting and the results were documented in a report entitled “A Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation of a 48 Acre Property (APN 3128-008-008) in the City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California” dated January 18, 2006. A survey of the project site was conducted on December 25 and 26, 2005. Much of the property is covered by a scattering of windblown cans with depositional loci. Locus 1 consists of several dense refuse concentrations located in the bottom of a shallow wash. These areas consist of old milled lumber construction refuse, tin cans, asphalt and roofing shingles, etc and date from the mid 1950s through the mid 1970s. Assessment of these materials determined that this dump site does not represent a significant or unique historic resource. Locus 2 consists of a medium density scatter of approximately 400 condensed milk and juice tins mixed with small fragments of glass, porcelains and domestic china. A single amber duraglas bottle bottom carried a 1951 date, indicating the deposit was from the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Based on an assessment of visible materials, this site does not qualify as significant under CEQA.

Development of the proposed project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or geologic feature. No human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, were discovered on the site. Therefore, no impacts to cultural resources would occur.

However, in the event that cultural resources are encountered during the course of construction activities, all work shall cease until a qualified archaeologist determines the proper disposition of the resource.

VI. a. The site is not identified as being in or in proximity to a fault rupture zone (LMEA Figure 2.5) and is not identified as being subject to liquefaction (LMEA Figure 2-6). According to the Seismic Hazard Evaluation of the Lancaster East and West Quadrangles, the project site may be subject to intense seismic shaking (LMEA p. 2-16). However, future development of each lot would be constructed in accordance with the seismic requirements of the Uniform Building Code (UBC) as adopted by the City, which would render any potential impacts to less than significant. The site is generally level and is not subject to landslides (LMEA Figure 2-6).

b. The site is rated as having a moderate 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 project would be required, under the provisions of Lancaster Municipal Code (LMC) Chapter 8.16, to adequately wet or seal the soil to prevent wind erosion. Water erosion controls must be provided as part of the project grading plan to be reviewed and approved by the City's Engineering Division. These provisions, which are a part of the project, would ensure impacts from soil erosion are less than significant.

c. The project site is not known to be within an area subject to fissuring, sinkholes (LMEA Figure 2-3) or liquefaction (LMEA Figure 2-6). Therefore, no impacts would occur.

d. The soil is characterized by a low-shrink-swell potential (LMEA p. 2-5 to 7 and Figure 2-3). A soils report on the property shall be submitted to the City by the project developer prior to grading of the property and recommendations of the report shall be incorporated into development of the property. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e. Sewer would be available to serve the project site from Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 14 upon annexation and would be utilized by the proposed project (ref. Item XVI.b and letters from the Sanitation District). The use of septic tanks or other alternative waste water disposal systems is not necessary and would not be incorporated into the development. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

VII. a-b. The proposed project consists of the subdivision of the project site into 45 industrial lots and would not involve the routine use, transportation or disposal of hazardous materials. As each lot is developed, the uses on the individual lot may utilize hazardous materials. Use of hazardous materials would be conducted in accordance with all applicable laws, rules, and regulations which would ensure that any potential impact would be less than significant. Typical construction materials would be utilized during development of each lot. These uses would be similar to other industrial uses in the area. The proposed project is not located along a hazardous waste transportation corridor (LMEA Figure 9.1-4); therefore no impacts are anticipated to occur. The project site is currently vacant and no demolition activities would be required. Development of each of the individual lots would not expose individuals or the environment to asbestos containing materials or lead-based paint. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c. The project site is not located within a half mile of an existing school. The closest school is New Vista School located at 753 East Avenue K-2. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for the proposed project by Earth Systems Southern California. The findings of the study are documented in a report entitled "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Assessor's Parcel Number 3182-008-008, Avenue L-4 and 5th Street West, Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California," and dated December 29, 2005. As part of the environmental site assessment, a site visit was conducted on December 20, 2005. No hazardous materials were observed to be used, stored, or disposed of on the subject site.

In addition to the site visit, a regulatory records review was conducted for the project site. The database search was conducted using publicly available regulatory records detailed in a report from Environmental Data Resource, Inc. The subject property and adjoining parcels were not identified as having hazardous materials use, storage, disposal, or release sites on any databases. However, thirty-four hazardous materials use, storage, disposal, or release sites were identified within a one-mile radius of the subject property. Eight of the thirty-four identified site have had a reported spill or release of hazardous materials. Of the eight hazardous materials release sites, five have received regulatory agency closure and are therefore not considered a recognized environmental condition for the subject property. The remaining three hazardous materials release sites have not received regulatory agency closure and are located within .7 miles of the property and involve hydrocarbon (fuel) contamination. Open fuel leak sites that are within 250-feet in the upgradient direction are considered to have potential risk to the subsurface soils and/or groundwater of the property. No open fuel leak sites were identified within .3 miles of the property. No environmental concerns for the property were noted and no potential off-site sources of contamination were identified within a 1 mile radius. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

e-f. The proposed project is located within two miles of a public airport, public use airport, or private airstrip. The United States Air Force Plant 42 is located 1.5 miles southeast of the project site. However, the project site is not located within a clear zone or accident potential zone associated with the airport. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people working in the project area and no impacts would occur.

g. The project site is located along the southeast corner of future Avenue L-4 and future 5th Street West which have not been identified as evacuation routes (LMEA Figure 9.1-3). The proposed project would not impair or physically block any identified evacuation routes and would not interfere with any adopted emergency response plan. No impacts are anticipated.

h. The site could be subject to localized brush fires because the land to the east and west of the site vacant and portions on the land to the north and south are vacant. However, the site is within the urban service range of Los Angeles County Fire Station No. 129, located at 42110 6<sup>th</sup> Street West, which would be able to provide rapid response in the event of a fire. Impacts are, therefore, less than significant.

VIII. a. The project site is not located in an area with an open body of water or watercourse and is not in an aquifer recharge area. Additionally, the proposed subdivision would be required to comply with all applicable provisions 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 manage 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 as applicable, as determined by the City of Lancaster Department of Public Works. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed project involves the subdivision of the project site into 45 industrial lots. At this time no specific development has been proposed. However, as future development occurs on each lot, the potential exists for industrial discharge into a public water system and to potentially violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The County Sanitation Districts require industrial uses to complete additional forms when applying for a sewer connection in order to ensure that any discharges to the sewer system would not exceed the established waste discharge requirements. Completion and approval of this paperwork would ensure that impacts to the wastewater system are less than significant.

The site is not in proximity to an open body of water or watercourse and is not in an aquifer recharge area (LMEA p. 10.1-5 to 6). However, there is a dry stream course that runs through the center of the property which has been used for dumping in the past. Implementation of the proposed project would impact the existing stream course and mitigation measures have been identified (see Mitigation Measures 4 and 5 under Item IV.b). Additionally, the proposed project would be connected to the public sewer. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of the listed mitigation measures.

b. The proposed project would not include any groundwater wells or pumping activities. All water supplied to the proposed project would be obtained from Los Angeles County Water District No. 40 (LACWD), which has indicated that it can serve the project site. Additionally, as indicated in VIII.a., the proposed project would not impact any groundwater recharge areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge and impacts would be less than significant.

c-e. Future development would increase the amount of surface runoff as a result of impervious surfaces from the buildings and roadways being constructed. The 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 parcels. Therefore, impacts from drainage and runoff would be less than significant.

f-g. The project site is not within the 100- year floodplain. However, the project site is located in a 500-year floodplain (FIRM). Therefore, no flooding impacts would occur as a result of placing housing on the project site.

h. The project site does not contain and is not downstream from a dam or levee. Therefore, no impacts would occur from flooding as a result of the failure of a dam/levee.

i. The project site is not located within a coastal zone. Therefore, tsunamis are not a potential hazard. The project site is relatively flat and does not contain any enclosed bodies of water and is not located in close proximity to any other large bodies of water. Therefore, the proposed project would not be subject to inundation by seiches or mudflows. No impact would occur.

IX. a. The proposed project is not of the scale or nature that could physically divide an established community. The proposed project consists of the subdivision of 45 industrial lots in an area that is

designated as LI (Light Industrial) with LI (Light Industrial) zoning. The land to the east and west is vacant. The land to the north is mostly vacant; however, development exists along the northeastern portion of site. The property to the south is mostly vacant; however, a development exists along the eastern portion of the site. 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 is consistent with the City's General Plan and must be in conformance with the Lancaster Municipal Code. The project will be in compliance with the City-adopted UBC (Item VI.a.) and erosion-control requirements (Item VI.b.). Therefore, no impacts would occur.

c. As noted under Item IV.e-f., the project site is not subject to a habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

X. a-b. The project site does not contain any current mining or recovery operations for mineral resources and no such activities have occurred on the project site in the past. According to the LMEA (Figure 2-4), the project site is not designated as being in a Mineral Reserve Zone. Therefore, it is not considered likely that the site has large, valuable mineral and aggregate deposits. Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources would occur.

XI. a. The City's General Plan (Table III-1 and LMEA Table 8-10) establishes an outdoor maximum CNEL of 70 dBA for industrial areas. The current noise level on the major street closest to the project site (Sierra Highway between Avenue L to Columbia Way (Avenue M)) is estimated at 68.7 dBA (LMEA Table 8.11). Therefore, potential noise impacts associated with traffic from the proposed development and operational activities would be less than significant.

b. The proposed project consists of the subdivision of the project site into 45 industrial lots. No specific development has been proposed at this time. As development occurs on the individual lots, it is not anticipated that construction would require the use of machinery that generates ground-borne vibration as no major subsurface construction (e.g., parking garage) is planned. It is possible that individual developments could utilize ground mounted industrial-type equipment that generates ground vibration. However, this would be typical of industrial uses and is not anticipated to generated significant impacts.

c. Permanent increases in area levels would occur as a result of development of each industrial lot. These noise levels would be generated by normal activities that occur in an industrial setting (manufacturing, warehousing, etc.) and from motor vehicles (see discussion under XI.a.). Although the traffic generated by the project would contribute to an increase in noise levels in the area, the project's contribution would be minimal because the current and future projected noise levels would remain essentially unchanged with or without the project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d. The project consists of the subdivision of the project site into 45 industrial lots. No specific development has been proposed at this time. As development occurs on each of the individual lots, there would be a temporary increase in noise levels in the area during construction activities. Construction activities are regulated by Section 8.24.040 of the Lancaster Municipal Code which limits the hours of construction work to between sunrise and 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. Effects are not considered significant because they are temporary and construction times are limited to daylight hours.

e-f. The project site is located within two miles of United States Air Force Plant 42. The project site is located within the 65 dB CNEL noise contour. Since the project is industrial in nature, and a maximum outdoor CNEL of 70 is allowed for these uses, it is not anticipated that airport operations would negatively affect the proposed project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

XII. a. The proposed project consists of the subdivision of the project site into 45 industrial lots. No specific development has been proposed at this time. When individual lots are developed, they would create temporary construction jobs. These construction jobs would not be expected to result in any substantial population growth in the area. The work requirements of most construction projects are highly specialized so that construction workers remain at a job site only for the time frame in which their specific skills are needed. Therefore, project-related construction workers would not be likely to relocate their household's place of residence as a consequence of working on the proposed project. Employees for the proposed development would come from the local area and individuals would not relocate to the area in order to fill the jobs. Therefore, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in the area and impacts would be less than significant.

b-c. 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.

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

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

XIV. a-b. The proposed project would generate additional population growth and would contribute on an incremental basis to the use of the existing park and recreational facilities. However, the applicant would be required to pay park fees which would reduce potential impacts on park and recreational facilities to a level of insignificance.

XV. a. The proposed project consists of the subdivision of the project site into 45 industrial lots. No specific development has been proposed at this time. A traffic assessment was prepared for development of Phase IA of the proposed project by the City of Lancaster Traffic Engineering Division, entitled "Focused, Limited Review and Traffic Assessment for a Portion of Phase I of the Proposed Development at Avenue L-4 and Sierra Highway", dated March 27, 2009.

Phase I is expected to generate approximately 184 a.m. peak hour trips and 204 p.m. peak hour trips. These trips were distributed on the surrounding street system to determine potential impacts (see Table 1). As shown in Table 1, significant impacts were identified for four intersections. Mitigation measures 6 through 8 have been identified to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

**Table 1**  
**Intersection Levels of Service**

Intersection	Peak Hour	2013 Without the Project		2013 With Phase 1A	
		V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS
Avenue "L-4"/Sierra Highway	PM	48.1	E	71.2	F
Enterprise Parkway/Sierra Highway	PM	36.2	E	34.4	D
Avenue "L-8"/ Sierra Highway	PM	35.7	E	37.4	E
Avenue M"/SR 14 NB Ramps	PM	44.7	E	47.4	E
Avenue M"/ SR 14 SB Ramps	PM	45.0	E	64.6	F

6. Restrict access at the intersection of Avenue L-4 and Sierra Highway to right turn entrance and right turn exit only. A raised median on Sierra Highway would fulfill this condition effectively.
7. Restrict access at the intersection of Avenue L-8 and Sierra Highway to right turn entrance and right turn exit only. As an interim measure, the installation of surface mounted channelizers and appropriate signing would suffice under Phase IA.
8. Contribute to the cost of installing traffic signals at both northbound and southbound ramps of State Route 14 at Avenue M (Columbia Way) as determined by the Director of Public Works. This project is pending addition to the City's capital program, subject to ongoing joint design and funding arrangements with CalTrans, the County of Los Angeles and the City of Palmdale. The project's payment of traffic signal fees could serve as sufficient mitigation of its significant traffic impacts at these locations.

b. There are no county congestion management agency designated roads or highways in the vicinity of the project. No impacts would occur.

c. The project site does not contain any aviation related uses, and the proposed project would not include the development of any aviation related uses. Thus, the proposed project would not have an impact on air traffic patterns.

d. Avenue L-8, Avenue L-4 and Enterprise Parkway would be improved to City standards adjacent to the site as part of the project. No hazardous conditions would be created by these improvements. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

e. Future development of each newly created lot would have adequate emergency access from Avenue L-8, Avenue L-4 and Enterprise Parkway. Interior street circulation would be provided in accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles County Fire Department; therefore, no impacts would occur.

f. Development on each lot would be required to provide for off-street parking per the provisions of the Municipal Code. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

g. The future development of each lot would not conflict with or impede any of the General Plan policies or specific actions related to alternative modes of transportation (Lancaster General Plan pgs. V-16 to V-21). Therefore, no impacts would occur.

XVI. a. The proposed project consists of the subdivision project site into 45 industrial lots. No specific development has been proposed on these lots. As the lots develop, the developments would either discharge to a local sewer line, not maintained by the Districts or to the Districts' Amargosa Creek Trunk Sewer located in Wall Street and Avenue L-4. Project wastewater would be treated at the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant upon annexation. Development on the individual lots is likely to generate industrial wastewater. These developments would comply with all rules and regulations with respect to industrial wastewater discharge. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and impacts would be less than significant.

b. Wastewater from the proposed project would be treated at the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant, which has a design capacity of 16 million gallons per day (gpd) and is currently processing an average flow of 13.7 mgd (see LACSD letter). The project consists of the subdivision of the project site into 45 industrial lots. No specific development has been proposed at this time and no wastewater would be anticipated. As development occurs on the individual lots, impacts to the wastewater treatment plant would be assessed as part of the project specific environmental review. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c. See Items VIII.c and VIII.d.

d. The Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 has not indicated any problems in supplying water to the proposed project from existing facilities (reference letters in case file). No new construction of water treatment facilities or new or expanded entitlements would be required. Therefore, water impacts would be less than significant.

e. See Item XVI.b.

f-g. The subdivision would not generate additional solid waste, or contribute to an overall cumulative impact on the landfill service the site (GPEIR pgs. 5.9-20 to 21). Future development on the newly created lots would be required to have trash collection services in accordance with City contracts with waste haulers over the life of the project. These haulers are required to be in compliance with applicable regulations on solid waste transport and disposal, including waste stream reduction mandated under Assembly Bill (AB) 939, which was enacted to reduce, recycle, and reuse solid waste generated in California to the maximum extent feasible. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

b. The proposed project does not have any impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Ref. Items III, XI, XV.

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

List of Referenced Documents and Available Locations\*:

BRR	Focused Survey for Desert Tortoise and Western Burrowing Owl, and Habitat Evaluation for Mohave Ground Squirrel On APN 3128-008-008, a 48-acre± Site in the City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California, Circle Mountain Biological Consultants, January 2006.	CD
CRA	A Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation of a 48 Acre Property (APN 3128-008-008) in the City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California, Groark Historical Consulting, January 18, 2006.	CD
ESA:	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Assessor's Parcel Number 3128-008-008, Avenue L-4 and 5 <sup>th</sup> Street West, Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California, Earth Systems Southern California, December 29, 2005.	CD
FIRM:	Flood Insurance Rate Map	PW
GIR:	Update Geotechnical Investigation Report, Proposed Industrial/Commercial Development APN 3128-008-008, Avenue L-4 and 5 <sup>th</sup> Street West, Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California December 29, 2005	CD
GPEIR:	Lancaster General Plan Environmental Impact Report	PD
ITE:	Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual, 8 <sup>th</sup> Edition	PW
LACSD:	County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, May 18, 2006	CD
LGP:	Lancaster General Plan	PD
LMC:	Lancaster Municipal Code	PD
LMEA:	Lancaster Master Environmental Assessment	PD
LACWD:	Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40, June 19, 2006	CD
SLR:	Site Liquefaction Review, Proposed Industrial/Commercial Development, Tentative Parcel No. 66115, Avenue L-4 and 5 <sup>th</sup> Street West, Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California, June 17, 2009	CD
SSHZ:	State Seismic Hazard Zone Maps	PD
TRA:	Focused, Limited Review and Traffic Assessment for a Portion of Phase I of the Proposed Development at Avenue L-4 and Sierra Highway, City of Lancaster Traffic Engineering Department, March 27, 2009	CD
USDA SCS:	United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Maps	PD
USGS:	United States Geological Survey Maps	PD

\* PD: Planning Department  
PW: Public Works Department  
Lancaster City Hall  
44933 Fern Avenue  
Lancaster, California 93534