

ORDINANCE NO. 991

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA, AMENDING THE CITY ZONING PLAN FOR 28.5± ACRES LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF AVENUE J AND 60TH STREET WEST, KNOWN AS ZONE CHANGE NO. 11-03

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 17.24.060 of the Municipal Code, a request has been filed by Pacific Communities Inc., to change the zoning designation on 28.5± acres of land located at the northwest corner of Avenue J and 60th Street West from LI (Light Industrial) to R-7,000 (single family residential, minimum lot size 7,000 square feet); and

WHEREAS, notice of intention to consider the zone change of the subject property was given as required in Section 17.24.110 of the Municipal Code and Section 65854 and 65905 of the Government Code of the State of California; and

WHEREAS, staff has performed necessary investigations, prepared a written report, and recommended that the zone change request be approved; and

WHEREAS, public hearings on the zone change request were held before the Planning Commission on April 15, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed and approved the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the State Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act prior to taking action; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission adopted the mitigation measures contained in Exhibit "A"; and

WHEREAS, the City Council hereby makes the following findings in support of the Ordinance:

1. The proposed zone change from LI to R-7,000 is consistent with the General Plan land use designation of UR (Urban Residential, 2.1 to 6.5 dwelling units per acre) proposed for the subject property.
2. A need for the proposed zone classification of R-7,000 exists within such area in order to allow for the logical location of residential development to provide a variety of housing types to meet the economic, lifestyle and social needs of current and future residences.
3. The particular property under consideration is a proper location for said zone classification within such area, because it is of the size and shape to allow for residential development compatible with the existing R-7,000 Zone to the west of

the site, the approved single-family lots to the north and the existing single-family homes to the south.

4. Placement of the proposed zone at such location will be in the interest of public health, safety and general welfare and in conformity with good zoning practices, because adequate services, facilities, and infrastructure exist to accommodate the proposed density and type of development, and the zoning designation will not result in the development of incompatible uses.

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA, DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. That the subject property is reclassified from LI (Light Industrial) to R-7,000 (single family residential, minimum lot size 7,000 square feet).

Section 2. That the City Clerk shall certify to the passage of this Ordinance, and will see that it is published and posted in the manner required by law.

I, Geri K. Bryan, CMC, City Clerk of the City of Lancaster, do hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was regularly introduced and placed upon its first reading on the 14th day of May, 2013, and placed upon its second reading and adoption at a regular meeting of the City Council on the ____ day of _____, 2013, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

GERI K. BRYAN, CMC
City Clerk
City of Lancaster

R. REX PARRIS
Mayor
City of Lancaster

CERTIFICATION OF ORDINANCE
CITY COUNCIL

I, _____, _____ City of Lancaster, California,
do hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of the original Ordinance No. 991, for which
the original is on file in my office.

WITNESS MY HAND AND THE SEAL OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER, on this
_____ day of the _____, _____.

(seal)

| Mit. / Cond. No. | Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval | Monitoring Milestone (Frequency) | Method of Verification | Party Responsible for Monitoring | VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|----------------------------|------|---------|
| | | | | | Initials | Date | Remarks |
| HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS | | | | | | | |
| 1 | A burrowing owl survey shall be conducted within 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 to determine the appropriate mitigation/management requirements for the species. | 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/ Engineering responsible for reviewing report. | | | |
| 2 | 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 issuance of any permits (e.g., grading, stockpiling, etc.). | Prior to vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpile, or construction the City must receive a notification from the CDFG. | Prior to final approval of grading plan, issuance of a stockpile permit or any ground disturbing activities. | Planning Department/ Engineering responsible for reviewing notification. | | | |
| 3 | 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 notification. | | | |

| Mit. / Cond. No. | Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval | Monitoring Milestone (Frequency) | Method of Verification | Party Responsible for Monitoring | VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE | | |
|------------------------|---|--|--|---|----------------------------|------|---------|
| | | | | | Initials | Date | Remarks |
| 4 | A California Registered Geotechnical Engineer, or Civil Engineer experienced in geotechnical engineering, shall perform a liquefaction analysis for the project site. All recommendations identified in the liquefaction study shall be incorporated into the design of the proposed project. | Prior to vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpile, or construction the City must receive a liquefaction study from a California registered geotechnical engineer, or civil Engineer experienced in geotechnical engineering. | 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: GPA 11-03, ZC 11-03, CUP 11-09, VTTM 71563
2. Lead agency name and address: City of Lancaster
Planning Department
44933 Fern Avenue
Lancaster, California 93534
3. Contact person and phone number: Christopher Aune
(661) 723-6100
4. Applicant name and address: Pacific Communities Builder, Inc.
1000 Dove Street Suite 300
Newport Beach, CA 92660
5. Location: 28.5± gross acres on the northwest corner of 60th Street West and Avenue J
6. General Plan designation: Current: (LI) Light Industrial
Proposed: UR (Urban Residential, 2.1 – 6.5 dwelling units per acre)
7. Zoning: Current: (LI) Light Industrial
Proposed: R-7,000 (one single family dwelling unit per 7,000 square foot lot)
8. Description of project: The proposed project consists of the development of a 108 single family lot subdivision in the R-7,000 zone. As part of the proposed project a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change request are required to change the existing Light Industrial designations to the designations identified above. The project would include dedicating and improving a 200-foot-wide drainage channel along the southerly tract boundary. The Residential Planned Development (RPD) would allow for lot sizes that are smaller than 7,000 square feet and would ensure that future plot plans and elevation submittals include enhanced architectural details.
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: The project site is vacant land. Improved streets exist on the eastern and southern boundaries of the site. The California State Prison is located to the east of the project site and is designated P (Public) and is zoned P (Public). The property to the south is designated UR (Urban Residential, 2.1 – 6.5 dwelling units per acre), zoned R-7,000 (one single family dwelling unit per 7,000 square foot lot) and developed with single family residences. The property to the west is designated UR, zoned R-7,000, and is currently vacant but approved for 32 single family lots. The property to the north is designated LI (Light Industrial), zoned LI (Light-Industrial) and is approved for 41 single family lots.

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 Fire Department (fire access and life safety equipment)
- Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 14 (connection to public sewer)
- 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 and Forest Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <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/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.

Christopher Aune
Christopher Aune

3/15/13
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” 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 AND FOREST 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. 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 the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project: | | | | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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 |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526)? | | | | X |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |
| III. <u>AIR QUALITY</u> -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan? | | | | X |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | | | X | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | | | X | |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | | | X | |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | | | X | |
| IV. <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u> -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | | X | | |
| 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 US Fish and Wildlife Service? | | X | | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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 Community Conservation 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 | |
| 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 |

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

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| VII. <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 any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | | | X | |
| VIII. <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 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 |

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

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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 | |
| 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 |
| X. <u>LAND USE AND PLANNING</u> -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Physically divide an established community? | | | | X |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | | | | X |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan? | | | | X |
| XI. <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 |
| XII <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 |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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 |
| XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- 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 |
| XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES | | | | |
| 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 | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| Other public facilities? | | | | X |
| XV. RECREATION -- | | | | |
| 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 |
| XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | | | X | |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards 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 |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | | | | X |
| XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- 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 | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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 | |
| XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE -- | | | | |
| 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 two scenic areas are available from the roadways and area surrounding the project site as identified by the General Plan (LMEA Figure 12-1). These scenic vistas include views of the Foothill Area (Scenic Area 1) and Quartz Hill (Scenic Area 3). Additionally, views of the mountains and open desert are available from the project site. With implementation of the proposed project the available views of the identified scenic resources would not change and would continue to be available

from the streets and the surrounding area. Therefore, no impacts to scenic vistas would occur as a result of the proposed project.

b. The project site consists of approximately 28.5 gross acres of disturbed desert. One Joshua tree is located on the project site. The project site does not contain any buildings (historic or otherwise) or any 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. Development of the proposed project would change the visual character of the project site in that it would replace vacant land with a 108 single family residences which are similar to the residential tracts located to the south of the project site. Additionally, the proposed project is in conformance with the City's General Plan and zoning requirements for the area. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d. No lighting currently exists on the project site; however ambient lighting in the area is fairly bright due to the prison and other residential uses. The proposed project would generate light from conditions typically found in residential areas such as street lights, interior lighting and front and backyard lights. These would be similar to lighting conditions found in the residential developments to the south of the project site. Structures would be constructed from non-reflective materials to the extent possible. Therefore, light and glare impacts would be less than significant.

II. a-b. 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.

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. The project site is not currently utilized for agricultural production and contains no forests or timberland. The proposed project would not result in other changes to the existing environment that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or the conversion of forest land to non-forest uses. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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 to 5.5-22). At this time the proposed project is not consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Code because the proposed project is for single-family dwelling units not industrial type uses. However, traffic generation from residential uses is less than typical industrial uses therefore; the project would produce fewer emissions than would be anticipated by an industrial use. Therefore, the project itself would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan and no impacts would occur.

b. Construction of the proposed project would generate emissions associated with grading, use of heavy equipment, construction worker vehicles, etc. However, these are not anticipated to exceed the construction emission thresholds established by the local air district due to the small size of the development. Therefore, construction emissions would be less than significant.

The proposed project would generate approximately 1,034 new vehicle trips per day according to the City of Lancaster's Traffic Division estimate dated January 18, 2013. These trips would generate air emissions; however, due to the small amount of traffic generated, these emissions would not be sufficient to create or significantly contribute towards violations of the air quality standards. Therefore, emissions associated with the operation of the proposed development would be less than significant.

c. The proposed project, in conjunction with other development as allowed by the General Plan, would result in a cumulative net increase of pollutants. However, since the emissions associated with the construction of the proposed project are less than significant since the proposed project is for the subdivision of one lot into four single family residential lots, its contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. Impacts would therefore be less than significant.

d. The closest sensitive receptors are the single family residences to the south. 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. Construction and operation of the proposed development is not anticipated to produce significant objectionable odors. Construction equipment may generate some odors, but these odors would be similar to those produced by vehicles traveling on Avenue J or 60th Street West. Most objectionable odors are typically associated with industrial projects involving the use of chemicals, solvents, petroleum products and other strong smelling elements used in manufacturing processes, as well as sewage treatment facilities and landfills. These types of uses are not part of the proposed project. Odors may also be generated by typical residential activities (e.g., cooking). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

IV. a. A biological resources survey conducted for the proposed project by Mark Hagan, and documented in a report entitled "Biological Resource Assessment of TTM 71563, Lancaster California" and dated March 8, 2011.

On March 5 and 6, 2011, a site visit and survey of the project site was conducted. The project site was characteristic of a highly disturbed desert scrub plant community. A total of thirty-two plant species and fourteen wildlife species or their sign were observed during the line transect survey. No desert tortoises (*Gopherus agassizii*) or their sign were observed during the field survey. No burrowing owls (*Athene curricularia*) or sign were observed during the field survey. No potential sites for burrowing owls were observed within the study site. However, it is possible that burrowing owls could inhabit that project site prior to the start of construction. No bird nests were observed within the project site; however, potential nesting sites do exist within the project site. The project site is not located within the accepted geographic range of the Mohave ground squirrel (*Spermophilus mohavensis*). In addition, suitable habitat for Mohave ground squirrels is not present. No state or federally listed species are expected to occur within the proposed project area. With incorporation of the following mitigation measure impacts to burrowing owls would remain less than significant level.

1. A burrowing owl survey shall be conducted within 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 to determine the appropriate mitigation/management requirements for the species.

b. A 4- to 5-foot deep manmade drainage channel crosses through the northern portion of the site. Additionally, several natural drainages cross the project site. Development of the proposed project would eliminate the existing drainages. These drainages may be considered 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. Therefore, the following mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

2. 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.).
3. 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 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. 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 C.A. Singer and Associates and the results were documented in a report entitled, "Phase I Cultural Resource Study: West Avenue 'J' and 60th Street West (Los Angeles County APN: 3203-008-035 & 3203-008-48), TT: 71563" dated April 19, 2011. A survey of the project site was conducted on April 2, 2011. As a result of this survey and a review of the existing literature, two historic sites were identified. Site 19-002287 consists of a historic period occupation and agricultural site containing refuse from 1885-1910 and additional debris from 1930-1950. Site 19-002888 consists of several historic period trash deposits dating from the 1930s to 1950s. Both of these sites have been highly disturbed and therefore are not considered significant resources. Development of the site would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resources, site or geologic feature. No human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, were discovered on the project site. However, in the event that cultural resources are encountered during the course of construction activities, all work shall cease until a qualified archaeologist determines the proper disposition of the resource. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

VI. a. The 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)

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).

The project site is located within an area that is designated as having potential liquefaction hazards per the State Seismic Hazards Map (SSHZ Maps). Therefore, the following mitigation measure is required to minimize the effects of anticipated seismic settlements.

4. A California Registered Geotechnical Engineer, or Civil Engineer experienced in geotechnical engineering, shall perform a liquefaction analysis for the project site. All recommendations identified in the liquefaction study shall be incorporated into the design of the proposed project.

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) however, it is designated as having potential liquefaction hazards per the State Seismic Hazards Map (SSHZ Maps). For more information regarding liquefaction, refer to Item VI.a. Additionally, the proposed project would be constructed in accordance with the seismic requirements of the Uniform Building Code (UBC) as adopted by the City. With implementation of the mitigation measure identified in Item VI.a, potential impacts would be less than significant.

d. The soil on the project site is characterized by a low shrink-swell potential (LMEA Figure 2-3). However, 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 letter from the Sanitation District). The use of septic tanks or other alternative waste water disposal systems is not necessary and would not be incorporated into the development. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

VII. a-b. The proposed project consists of the construction and occupancy of 108 single family residences. As discussed in Item III.b, the project would generate emissions during construction activities, some of which may be greenhouse gases. These emissions are anticipated to be less than the thresholds established by the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District and would not prevent the State from reaching its greenhouse gas reduction targets. Occupancy of the proposed project would generate minimal amounts of emissions, primarily from vehicles traveling to and from the residences. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

VIII. a-b. The proposed project consists of the construction and occupancy of 108 single family residences. The proposed project would not involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. The proposed project would use minimal amounts of hazardous materials (typical construction materials) during development. Occupants of the subdivision would typically utilize household cleaners (e.g., cleanser, bleach, etc.), fertilizer, and potentially limited use of common pesticides. These uses would be similar to other residential development in the area. Use of all materials would be in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations. 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 the proposed project 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 quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The closest school is Sundown Elementary located at 6151 West Avenue J-8, approximately ½ mile south of the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

d. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for the proposed project by Global Geo-Engineering Inc. The findings of the study are documented in a report entitled "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Tentative Tract 71563 APN #s 3203-008-035 and 3203-008-048 Lancaster, California" and dated March 24, 2011. As part of the environmental site assessment, a site visit was conducted on March 8, 2011. The site consists of vacant land and the ground surface is covered by a light to moderate growth of grasses and brush. A 4- to 5-foot deep manmade drainage channel crosses through the northern portion of the site. No current or past uses likely to involve the use, treatment, storage, disposal, or generation of hazardous substances or petroleum products were identified during the site reconnaissance. No obvious recognized environmental conditions were observed for the property during the site reconnaissance.

In addition to the site visit, a regulatory database search was conducted for the project site and the surrounding area. The database search was conducted using publicly available regulatory records detailed in the Environmental Data Resources, Inc., (EDR) report. The project site and property within standard distances of the project site were reviewed to identify adjacent and surrounding sites that might potentially impact the soil and/or groundwater conditions beneath the property. The project site was not identified on any of these listings. A closed leaking underground storage tank case was identified approximately ¼ mile from the site. Additionally, the California State Prison Los Angeles County (Antelope Valley State Prison) was identified on the ENVIROSTOR database. The site was found to be contaminated with heavy metals in 1991. No further details of the current site status were provided in the EDR database. Additional information was researched on the DTSC ENVIROSTOR and California Regional Water Quality Control Board (CRWQCB) *GeoTracker* internet databases. The ENVIROSTOR database does not provide a cleanup status or potential contamination information. This site is not anticipated to impact the project site as it is down gradient from the project site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e-f. The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport, public use airport, or private airstrip. The closest airports are For Field which is located more than 3 miles north of the project site and Air Force Plant 42 which is located more than 7 miles south-east of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working the project area and no impacts would occur.

g. The project site is located along 60th Street West which has not been identified as an evacuation route (LMEA Figure 9.1-4) and Avenue J, which has been identified as an evacuation route in the vicinity of the project site. However, the traffic generated by the proposed project is not sufficient to cause impacts at any of the significant intersections in the area. Therefore, 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 California State Prison is located to the east of the project site. The property to the south is developed with single family residential uses. The properties to the west and north are vacant. It is possible that the project site could be susceptible to grass fires because of the adjacent vacant property. However, the project site is located within the boundaries of Los Angeles County Fire Station No. 130, located at 44558 40th Street West, which would serve the site in the event of a fire. Therefore, impacts from wild land fires would be less than significant.

IX. a. The proposed project consists of the construction and occupation of 108 single family residences. As such, the proposed project would not generate wastewater which would violate water quality standards or exceed waste discharge requirements.

Additionally, the project site is not in area with an open body of water or watercourse and is not in an aquifer recharge area (LMEA p. 10.1-5 to 7). There would be no discharge into a water body or the aquifer as a result of surface runoff from the project. Additionally, the proposed project would be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Program, including Best Management Practices. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b. The proposed project would not include any groundwater wells or pumping activities. All water supplied to the proposed project would be obtained from Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40. Additionally, as indicated in IX.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. The proposed project consists of the construction of 108 residential lots. Development of the site would increase the amount of surface runoff as a result of impervious surfaces associated with the project. 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 site. Therefore, impacts from drainage and runoff would be less than significant.

f-g. The project site is designated as Flood Zone X-Shaded per the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Panel No. 060672 (2008). This area is outside of the 100-year but within the 500-year flood zones. Therefore, no flooding impacts would occur as a result of placing housing or structures 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.

X. a. The proposed project is not of the scale or nature that could physically divide an established community. The proposed project consists of the construction of a 108 residential lots in an area that would be designated as Urban Residential (UR) with R-7,000 (one single family dwelling unit per 7,000 square foot lot) zoning with the approval of the project. The California State Prison is located to the east of the project site. The property to the south is developed with single family residential uses. The properties to the west and north are vacant. 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 will be consistent with the City's General Plan upon adoption of the General Plan Amendment 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 and would not conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

XI. 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 is not designated as Mineral Reserve Zone. Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources would occur.

XII. a. The City's General Plan (Table III-1) establishes an outdoor maximum CNEL of 65 dBA for residential projects. The current noise level on 60th Street West (between Avenue I to Avenue J) is estimated at 59.3 dBA (LMEA Table 8-11). The current noise level on Avenue J (between 70th Street West to 60th Street West) is estimated at 60.8 dBA (LMEA Table 8-11). While this noise level is consistent with the standards of the General Plan additional features of the proposed project (e.g., landscaping, block wall, etc.) would ensure that the project remains in compliance with the General Plan. 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 construction and occupancy of 108 residential lots. It is not anticipated that construction of the proposed project would require the use of machinery that generates ground-borne vibration as no major subsurface construction (e.g., parking garage) is planned. No ground mounted industrial-type equipment that generates ground vibration would be utilized during occupancy of the proposed residences. Therefore, no impacts associated with ground-borne vibration/noise are anticipated.

c. Permanent increases in area levels would occur once the residential project is completed and occupied. These noise levels would be generated by normal activities that occur in a residential setting

(yard work, radio, television sets, etc.) and from motor vehicles (see discussion under XII.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 proposed project consists of the construction and occupancy of 108 residences. There would be a temporary increase in noise levels in the area during construction of the proposed project. This noise would be generated by construction vehicles and equipment. Construction activities of the project are regulated by Section 8.24.040 of the Lancaster Municipal Code, which limits the hours of construction work to between sunrise and 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. Effects are not considered significant because they are temporary and construction times are limited to daylight hours.

e-f. The project site is not in proximity to an airport or a frequent overflight area and would not experience noise from these sources (see also VII e-f). Therefore, no impacts would occur.

XIII. a. The project would generate additional population growth in the immediate area because 108 new dwelling units would be constructed. This additional increase would contribute, on an incremental basis, to a cumulative increase in the population of the City. The project site is within the urban core of the City and within the service area of both the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and Station 130 of the Los Angeles County fire Department. Therefore, the project would not result in a need for additional facilities to provide these services and impacts from increased population growth would be less than significant. Therefore, 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.

XIV. 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 XIII) and, therefore, would not substantially increase demand on parks or other public facilities. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

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

XV. 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 level of insignificance. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

XVI. a. The proposed project would generate approximately 1,034 new vehicle trips per day according to the City of Lancaster's Traffic Division. The traffic generated is not anticipated to adversely affect traffic flow on any of the adjoining public streets, and the improvements to be provided as part of

the project would ensure necessary, adequate circulation and safety levels for both project-related traffic and long-term cumulative increases. These improvements are identified as conditions of project approval and implementation of these improvements would ensure that impacts are less than significant.

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. 60th Street West and Avenue J 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. The project would have adequate emergency access from 60th Street West and Avenue J. Interior circulation would be provided in accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles County Fire Department; therefore, no impacts would occur.

f. The proposed project does not conflict with or impede any of the General Plan policies or specific actions related to alternative modes of transportation (Lancaster General Plan pgs. 5-18 to 5-24). Therefore, no impacts would occur.

XVII. a. The proposed project is outside the jurisdictional boundaries of the Sanitation District and will require annexation into District No. 14 before sewage service can be provided to the proposed development. The wastewater flow would discharge to the Districts' Avenue "J" West Trunk Sewer, located in Avenue J at 60th Street West. Project wastewater would be treated at the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant. As the proposed project is a residential development, it would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements and impacts would be less than significant.

b. Wastewater generated from the proposed project would be treated at the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant, which has a design capacity of 16 million gallons per day (mgd) and is currently processing an average flow of 13.5 mgd (see LACSD letter). The proposed project is anticipated to generate approximately 17,680 gallons of wastewater per day, which is within the available capacity of the treatment plant (see LACSD letter). The proposed project would not require the expansion of existing facilities or the construction of new facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c. See Items IX.c and IX.d.

d. The City of Lancaster Planning Director has granted the applicant's request for 114 acre feet of water per year from the allotment that was granted to the City of Lancaster by Los Angeles County Water Works. No new construction of water treatment facilities or new or expanded entitlements would be required (see Planning Director letter). Therefore, water impacts would be less than significant.

e. See Item XVII.b.

f-g. The project would generate additional solid waste, which would contribute to an overall cumulative impact on the landfill service the site (GPEIR pgs. 5.9-20 to 21); although this project's

individual contribution is considered minimal. The proposed project would be required to have trash collection services in accordance with City contracts with waste haulers over the life of the project. These haulers are required to be in compliance with applicable regulations on solid waste transport and disposal, including waste stream reduction mandated under Assembly Bill (AB) 939, which was enacted to reduce, recycle, and reuse solid waste generated in California to the maximum extent feasible. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

XVIII.a. Ref. Items I, III, IV, V, VIII, X, and XVII.

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

c. Ref. Items III, VI, VIII, IX, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI, and XVII.

List of Referenced Documents and Available Locations*:

| | | |
|-----------|--|----|
| BRR: | Biological Resource Assessment of TTM 71563, Lancaster California, Mark Hagan, March 8, 2011. | PD |
| CRS: | Phase I Cultural Resource Study: West Avenue 'J' and 60 th Street West (Los Angeles County APN: 3203-008-035 & 3203-008-48), TT: 71563, C.A. Singer and Associates, April 19, 2011. | PD |
| ESA: | Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Tentative Tract 71563 APN #s 3203-008-035 and 3203-008-048, Lancaster, California, Global Geo-Engineering, Inc., March 24, 2011 | PD |
| FIRM: | Flood Insurance Rate Map | PW |
| GPEIR: | Lancaster General Plan Environmental Impact Report | PD |
| LACSD: | County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, April 12, 2011 | PD |
| LACW | Lancaster Planning Director water allocation letter, January 28, 2013 | PD |
| LGP: | Lancaster General Plan | PD |
| LMC: | Lancaster Municipal Code | PD |
| LMEA: | Lancaster Master Environmental Assessment | PD |
| LTED | Lancaster Traffic Engineering Division Memo | PW |
| SSHZ: | State Seismic Hazard Zone Maps | PD |
| USGS: | United States Geological Survey Maps | PD |
| USDA SCS: | United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Maps | PD |

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