NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Pursuant to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, Sections 15072 and 15073, as amended to date, this is to advise that the City of Palmdale, which is the lead agency overseeing this project, has completed a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the proposed project described below.

Project No.: Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) 84099 and Site Plan Review (SPR) 22-018

Project Location: One parcel totaling approximately 40 acres located on the northeast corner of East Avenue M and 40th Street East in the IND (Industrial) General Plan land use designation and the HI (Heavy Industrial) zone (APN: 3170-014-014), City of Palmdale, County of Los Angeles

Project Description: A proposal to subdivide one parcel into two parcels for the purpose of constructing one warehouse building and one mechanical storage building with an office totaling 39,400 square feet.

Public Review Period: The Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for public review and comment pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 15072 and 15073 (California Environmental Quality Act). All comments must be submitted in writing to the address below. Please refer to this project by the file/index number listed above. If you have no comment, no reply is necessary. The City of Palmdale does not limit public comments to only the circulation period. Comments can be submitted for consideration up until final action is taken by a vote of the approving authority. The review period has not been shortened pursuant to Section 15105 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. The comment period during which the City will receive comments on the Mitigated Negative Declaration is:

Starting Date: April 10, 2023          Ending Date: May 10, 2023

Public Hearing: The City of Palmdale Planning Commission is tentatively scheduled to make a decision regarding this project and the associated Mitigated Negative Declaration on May 11, 2023, in the City Hall Council Chamber at 38300 Sierra Highway, Suite B, Palmdale, California, at 7:00 p.m.
Responses and Comments: Please send your written comments to:

Sam Dominguez, Assistant Planner
City of Palmdale
Economic and Community Development Department – Planning Division
38250 Sierra Highway
Palmdale, California 93550
Phone (661) 267-5200
Email: sdominguez@cityofpalmdale.org

Document Availability:
Copies of the application, maps, plans, environmental documents, and other pertinent materials related to this application are available for public review at the Planning Division (38250 Sierra Highway) from 7:30 am to 6:00 pm Monday through Thursday and online at: www.cityofpalmdaleca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/13719/TPM-84099-Mitigated-Negative-Declaration-and-Initial-Study-PDF. In addition, environmental documents are also available for review at the Palmdale City Library (700 East Palmdale Boulevard), Parks and Recreation Department (827 East Avenue Q-9), and City Hall (38300 Sierra Highway, Suite A).

[Signature]
Brenda Magaña
Acting Planning Manager

4/10/2023
Date
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION and INITIAL STUDY

Warehouse and Mechanic Facilities

Prepared for:

City of Palmdale
38250 Sierra Highway
Palmdale, California 93550

Prepared by:
Mark Hagan
Wildlife Biologist
B.S. Degree, Wildlife Management
Humboldt State University
1. PROJECT TITLE: Warehouse and Mechanic Facilities

2. LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS:

City of Palmdale
Economic and Community Development Department, Planning Division
38250 Sierra Highway, Palmdale, California, 93550

3. CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER:

Eunice Ban, Contract Planner; 310.299.7627

4. PROJECT LOCATION: APN 3170-014-014, Palmdale, California. Approximately 37 acres (15 ha) within the 40 acre APN. Approximately 3 acres is a homestead and not part of the project. The project area is located north of Avenue M, and east of 40th Street East, T7N, R11W, the SW1/4 of the SW1/4 of Section 33 (Figures 1 and 2).

5. PROJECT SPONSOR’S NAME AND ADDRESS:

Shawna Ricker
661.952.77918
shawna@duke-engineering.com
Duke Engineering
44732 Yucca Avenue
Lancaster, California 93534

6. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: Industrial

7. ZONING: M-2

8. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: The proposed improvements for this project will include a lot split and development of a small satellite facility. A synopsis of the specific details are in the site plan (Figure 3):

- Lot split on the westernmost portion of the project site consisting of approximately 4.5 acres (150 feet east to west and 1,320 feet north to south)
- 2 single story prefabricated metal buildings and supporting infrastructure
- Warehouse building: 25,000 square feet
  - Will include restroom, and utility room
- Equipment Repair and Office building: 14,400 square feet
  - Will include kitchenette, restrooms, reception/waiting rooms
- 28 standard and 2 American Disability Act (ADA) parking spots, drive lanes and fire lanes, concrete flatwork, landscape, hardscape areas, and asphalt-concrete drive areas.
- Block walls along Avenue M and 40th Street East and 6 foot chain link fence, topped with 3 strand barb wire, with a rolling gate along the eastern and northern boundaries
- Underground stormwater detention system
- Off-site roadway improvements along 40th East and Avenue M, west and south of the project site respectively
Figure 1. Approximate location of APN 3170-014-014 as depicted on U.S.G.S. Quadrangle, Lancaster East, Calif., 7.5', 1974.
Figure 2. Closeup aerial of project area showing homestead (bordered in blue)(Google 2020).
Figure 3. Site Plan

9. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:
Land surrounding the project site are zoned Industrial to north, east, and west and Aerospace Industrial to the south. Adjacent and nearby uses also consist of solar fields, agricultural uses, and lands used by Plant 42 for aerospace (Figures 4 and 5).

10. OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement). Distribution of this document is appropriate, but not limited, to the following agencies:

Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1?

The Native American Heritage Commission was notified and responded with negative results on their sacred land search. A list of potential tribes that may be interested was provided. Consultation with appropriate tribes will be made and concerns incorporated into the CEQA document as needed.
Figure 4. Land uses surrounding the project site. Red and blue depicts APN 3170-014-014. Red borders the approximately 37 acre project site which is not the whole APN. The 37 acre site will be split consisting of a 4.5 acre (green border) and 32.5 acre parcel. Blue borders the homestead left out of the project site.
Figure 5. Excerpt from Palmdale General Plan 2045. Green circle indicates project site.
### 1. Aesthetics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project site is not located next to a state scenic highway and the area is not considered a scenic resource. The project site is situated next to existing agricultural fields, solar fields, and Plant 42 industrial development.

There are no trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings on the project site (Appendix A).

The proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings. This project site has been fully graded and used as an agricultural field since the 1940s. The adjacent areas are agricultural fields, solar fields, and aerospace industrial facilities (Plant 42). A major road is present along the southern boundary. Development as planned will blend with the surrounding area and will follow Palmdale Municipal Code (PMC) requirements such as those found in Chapter 17 for aesthetically pleasing construction.

This project would create a new source of light however, it would not be substantial given the existing surrounding uses specifically Plant 42 to the south. The project is incorporating within the development designs compliance with Palmdale Municipal Code requirements for lighting such as PMC 17.23. This project is situated within an industrial use area.
2. **Agriculture Resources:** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project site is zoned Industrial (Palmdale 2022, Figure 5). The site contains approximately 37 acres of Prime Farmland. The City of Palmdale contains approximately 4,898 acres of Prime Farmland within the City’s boundaries as noted in the General Plan (Palmdale 2022, Rincon 2022). There is approximately 4.5 million acres of Prime Farmland in California. Conversion of this 37 acres represents less than 1% of the available Prime Farmland in the City of Palmdale. It represents an infinitesimal percentage within the state of California. This 37 acres is located on the edge of a larger area of Prime Farmland which further mitigates the development’s impact on the remaining Prime Farmland within the City of Palmdale.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. There are no Williamson Act contracts within the City of Palmdale (Rincon 2022).

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?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no indication that development of this project would cause the conversion of adjacent farmland to non-agricultural use. The area, both project site and adjacent sites, are zoned heavy industrial and commercial.
3. **Air Quality:** 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? |  |  | X |

Development and operation of this project will comply with all applicable district rules and regulations, and proposed control measures as required by the Antelope Valley Desert Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD). By complying with these rules, regulations, and measures the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the air quality plan. This project is located within an appropriately zoned area (Industrial).

b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? |  |  | X |

The level of operations of this project is low and any air quality issues would be infinitesimal. An increase of only 18 daily trips a day over existing conditions, 9 each during peak pm and am timeframes (Ruettgers & Schuler 2023). Construction of the 2 buildings and surrounding infrastructure would be considered small and there is no indication significant impacts would be expected to occur. Development of much larger construction sites have shown through air quality studies to have no significant impact when following the AVAQMD rules and regulations.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? |  |  | X |

No sensitive receptors are present around the project site and therefore no exposure could occur.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? |  |  | X |

Typical construction odors would be expected and temporary not affecting a substantial number of people in this industrial area. Objectionable odors of the nature expected to affect substantial number of people would be those such as landfills, and sewage treatment facilities. This is a small satellite facility with 5 employees working on 3 to 4 trucks per day.
4. Biological Resources
Would the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a)</th>
<th>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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Results noted here are from Hagan 2022, Appendix B. This project is being developed on a previously developed site and is not expected to result in a significant adverse impact to biological resources. No sensitive wildlife sign was observed within the project site. There is no suitable habitat for sensitive plants within the site. Vegetation within the actual project site is unsuitable for nesting birds. There would be no impact to migratory birds from development of the project site. Swainson’s hawk is a state listed threatened species. There is suitable nesting habitat from the trees within the northeastern corner of the parcel for Swainson’s hawk and a known Swainson’s hawk nesting location within 5 miles of the project site (Hagan 2022). Foraging habitat is not considered to be present within the project site due to low prey base. No other migratory bird mitigations are necessary. No burrowing owls or their sign were observed within the site. No potential cover sites were observed within the project site.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>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 Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no riparian habitat or sensitive natural community present on the project site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are none of these features within the project site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no evidence of any movement corridors or nursery sites within this project area. This project will not interfere with the movement of fish or wildlife species, migratory corridors, or wildlife nursery sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are no sensitive resources within the project site which could be impacted (Hagan 2022).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Biological Resources

Would the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **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?

This project site is not within any approved Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or any other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

### 5. Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **a)** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?

No adverse change would be expected. A Cultural Resources Report was completed for the project site (Norwood 2022, Appendix C). There was no observation of any historical resources on the project site. The Records Search returned with a negative finding for cultural resources. However, mitigation measures will be employed in the event resources or remains are discovered during construction. These measures are listed in the MMRP (Appendix D).

- **b)** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

No archaeological resources are present within this project site (Norwood 2022). No indication of human remains was observed on the project site. The site was completely graded, recontoured, and in agricultural use since the 1940s (Norwood 2022).

- **c)** Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

No indication of human remains was observed on the project site. See b) above. Mitigation measures will be employed in the event resources or remains are discovered during construction. These measures are listed in the MMRP (Appendix D).
### 6. Energy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During construction and operation, this project will be required to comply with the latest Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and California Air Resources Board (CARB) emissions standards as well as Title 24 Building Efficiency Standards. Following these standards will ensure no significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources occur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficient?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This project will comply with applicable regulations and Palmdale General Plan policies to prevent wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during construction and operation. The project will construct and operate in a manner consistent with energy efficiency goals contained in the Palmdale Energy Action Plan. Construction and operation would comply with relevant provisions of the State’s CALGreen and Title 24 of the California Energy Code (Palmdale 2022, Rincon 2022).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Geology and Soils</strong>: Would the project...</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| a) Directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:  
   i) rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.  
   ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?  
   iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?  
   iv) Landslides? |  |  |  | X |
| i) the project site is not located within the Alquist-Priolo special studies zone (Bruin Geotechnical Services 2022).  
ii) Strong seismic shaking could occur anywhere in Southern California. The facilities would have to comply with the California Building Codes.  
iii) the potential for on-site liquefaction or seismically induced dynamic settlement should be negligible (Bruin Geotechnical Services 2022).  
iv) Site topography is relatively flat, hazards from landslides are considered negligible (Bruin Geotechnical Services 2022). |  |  |  |  |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? |  |  | X |  |
| Grading and soil disturbance will create some soil erosion and loss of topsoil but due to requirements in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPP) which will be part of the construction these actions will not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. The subject site drainage occurs by minor sheet flow and erosion could occur. Appropriate analysis, grading and drainage design and site maintenance should minimize the sheet flow erosion potential (Bruin Geotechnical Services 2022). |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |  |
| The project would comply with the California Building Code and incorporate recommendations from the geo-technical and soils report into the development of the project. |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |
| The expansion index tests (ASTM D 4829) indicate that the surficial soils are within the “very low” expansion category (Bruin Geotechnical Services. Therefore no substantial risks to life or property would be expected. |  |  |  |  |
### 7. Geology and Soils: Would the project Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant | 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 the disposal of waste water?

Based on the following excerpt from the geotechnical report; if the project site follows the recommendations in the follow on Percolation Feasibility Report, the site would be capable of supporting a septic tank system or alternative waste water disposal system.

“It is our professional opinion that the migration of effluent from the proposed septic system will not daylight and percolation will be mostly vertical, and the effluent discharge will not have an adverse impact in site stability of adjacent sites. Based on the material encountered during field testing, no impervious layers were encountered through to the depth explored. The percolation rates indicate very permeable soil with a mostly vertical path of migration. Please refer to the Percolation Feasibility Report completed by this firm for detailed information regarding percolation testing results, recommendations, and septic system design” (Bruin Geotechnical Services 2022).

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

The project site is on a previously developed site which has been graded and recontoured, no paleontological resources or unique geologic features are present or expected. However, mitigation measures will be employed in the event resources are discovered during construction. These measures are listed in the MMRP (Appendix D).
### 8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although an Air Quality and GHG Study was not accomplished a project of this small size, following all AVAQMD rules, would have a de minimums effect directly or indirectly.

| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | | | X |

Given that greenhouse gases would be well below the applicable AVAQMD Significant Emissions Thresholds no conflict could occur. The project incorporates energy-efficiency and green building standards as detailed within the California Building Standards Code and in the Palmdale General Plan.
9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a)</th>
<th>Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other than common hazardous materials used during construction and operation of a maintenance facility (such as petroleum-based fuels, oils, etc.) no large amount of hazardous materials usage is planned. Federal regulations rigorously regulate the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. Regulations will be followed in every aspect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| b) | Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? |
|    | X                                                                                                                                 |

Note a) above.

| c) | Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? |
|    | X                                                                                                                                 |

No schools are within one-quarter mile. In addition, this project is located in an area zoned industrial.

| d) | Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? |
|    | X                                                                                                                                 |

An Envirostor search was completed for the project site. No hazardous materials sites were within 0.5 miles of the project site (distance that was researched).

| 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                                                                                                                                 |

This project site would be within the Plant 42 airport land use plan. This project is within the approved zoning area and development was evaluated and approved for this location.

| 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                                                                                                                                 |

This project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

| g) | Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? |
|    | X                                                                                                                                 |

Development of this project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. This project is in an appropriately zoned area where these issues were previously considered when zoned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vacant and agricultural land with low growing vegetation, sparsely located single family homes, and Plant 42 is present adjacent and nearby the project site. The context of the project site is such that a risk to wildland fires would be anticipated to be low to nonexistent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project will apply National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) best management practices to ensure water quality standards and waste discharge requirements are met. The required Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) further ensures no violations occur. Mitigation measures to be applied are listed in the MMRP (Appendix D).

| 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 preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | | | X | |

This project site was previously an operating agricultural operation. Water usage for those operations is currently unknown however they would have been much higher than what this proposed facility would use. No substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or recharge would occur. Change from agriculture to a maintenance facility would be expected to benefit groundwater supplies by decreasing the volume of water used.

| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in: i) substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site? iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? iv) impede or redirect flood flows? | | | X | |

Best management practices as required by both NPDES and the SWPPP as overseen by Lahontan Water Quality Control Board ensures control of erosion and siltation during construction. Sufficient drainage controls through catch basins will be incorporated into the project development (Duke Engineering 2022).

| d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? | | | X | |

Not applicable.

| e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? | | | X | |

The proposed project is being developed within an already evaluated area zoned for industrial. This development is small, normal construction, and normal operations fitting within the bounds expected within the General Plan for build out (Palmdale 2022).
### 11. Land Use and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a previously developed site, no community would be divided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No conflict with any applicable plan or regulation would occur. The project site is zoned appropriately for the planned project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently there are no habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans that cover this area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12. Mineral Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project site is in an area that has already been developed, is small in nature, and is located within an already established area with major roads and facilities surrounding it. No loss of known mineral resources would occur due to development of this site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project site is in an area that has already been developed, is small in nature, and is located within an already established area with major roads and facilities surrounding it. No loss of known mineral resources would occur due to development of this site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 13. Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a)</strong> Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction of the site would be required to follow established standards within the General Plan (Palmdale 2022, Rincon 2022). This area is within an industrial area where noise sensitive receptors are not present. Construction noise would be considered normal conventional standard for this type of development.

| **b)** Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | | | X |

Normal conventional construction noise would be expected during development of this project. Operations would be consistent with an industrial area.

| **c)** For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | X |

Plant 42 (airport) is a military test site and may in the future be expanded to a commercial airport (Palmdale 2022). Development of this area was evaluated and approved within the Palmdale General Plan. This project will not exceed the acceptable height limits around the airport and does not require notification to FAA (Palmdale 2022, Rincon 2022).
### 14. Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No new homes are being proposed. This project is a relatively small business which would not generate substantial population growth.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | X |

No housing would be displaced due to development of this project site.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | X |

No people would be displaced due to development of this project site.

---

### 15. Public Services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, parks, other public facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project is compatible with the City’s land designation and impacts on public services were evaluated for the General Plan (Rincon 2022, Palmdale 2022). Construction would be required to meet all current fire codes. This facility is not expected to increase population levels that would impact or cause a need for new facilities.
### 16. Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Category</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a relatively small business that would not be expected to have a significant impact on parks or other recreational facility.

No recreational facilities nor need for recreational facilities will occur due to development of this project site.

### 17. Transportation

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

An evaluation of project vehicle miles traveled (VMT) was conducted and concluded this project did not meet the level which would require further analysis. Daily vehicle trips for this project was estimated at 18 which were significantly less than the 110 which would have required further analysis (Ruettgers & Schuler 2023).

Avenue M is an existing arterial road which forms the southern boundary of the study site. The western and eastern boundary are formed by dirt roads. Although improvements are planned no major redesign of these roads which would be incompatible to the vehicle types used.

Roads bordering the project site are sufficient to provide emergency access for this planned use. The project is within an already evaluated land designation for industrial use which has considered emergency access. In addition projected vehicle usage will be low.
<p>| 18. Tribal Cultural Resources: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is: |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1 (k) | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation | Less Than Significant | No Impact |
| There are no resources present on this site. The site was previously developed. Palmdale Planning will be reaching out to appropriate Tribes but no comments are expected. If any are received they will be incorporated into the construction plans. |
| b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and is supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe. |
| There are no resources present on this site. The site was previously developed. Palmdale Planning will be reaching out to appropriate Tribes but no comments are expected. If any are received they will be incorporated into the construction plans. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19. Utilities and Service Systems</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Require or result in the relocation or construction or new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project will develop a septic tank system to support the facilities. Construction and use of the system will follow all applicable laws and permitting requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two wells are present on the site. One will be abandoned following all well abandonment regulations and the remaining well will be used to supply the project site. Given that this was an active agricultural site the water usage would have been much higher than that expected to be used for this small facility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic tank system will be used therefore no determination would be required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impact the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient landfill space is available for a project this size. This project is not anticipated to impact attainment of solid waste reduction goals. Recycling protocols are part of normal operating functions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This new development would have to implement recycling programs with a 50% diversion of solid waste based on Assembly Bill 939 and the County Integrated Waste Management Plan. The project will comply with all federal, state, local management and reduction statutes/regulations for solid waste.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Mandatory Findings of Significances</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant with Mitigation</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, there are no valuable habitats, plants, or wildlife within this project site and no examples of California history or prehistory. This site was previously developed and operated as agriculture. It was completely graded and recontoured. No native or natural features exist within the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; 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)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cumulatively considerable impacts are expected from this project. The project has a small footprint, is within an already zoned industrial area which had been planned and evaluated within the General Plan (Palmdale 2022, Rincon 2022).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As noted in the individual elements of this checklist there are no significant impacts any of the categories. There is nothing unusual or large about this project. This is a conventional straightforward project that will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings directly or indirectly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix A  Photographs of Site
View from western boundary looking east.

View from east half of project site looking west.
View from southwest corner looking towards northeast.

View from northwest corner looking south.
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Abstract

Development has been proposed for APN 3170-014-014, Lancaster, California. The approximately 40 acre (16 ha) study area was located north of Avenue M and east of 40th Street East, T7N, R11W, the SW1/4 of the SW1/4 of Section 33, S.B.B.M. A line transect survey was conducted on 31 July 2022 to inventory biological resources. The proposed project area was characteristic of a fallow agricultural field with a homesite and ancillary facilities in the northeast corner. A total of 11 plant species and 15 wildlife species or their sign were observed during the line transect survey. Transects were not accomplished within the occupied portion of the study site. No desert tortoises (Gopherus agassizii) or their sign were observed during the field survey. The study site did not contain suitable habitat to support desert tortoises. No protection measures for desert tortoises are recommended. The proposed project site was located within the geographic range of the Mohave ground squirrel (Xerospermophilus mohavensis). The study site did not contain suitable habitat to support Mohave ground squirrels. No protection measures for Mohave ground squirrels are recommended. No burrowing owls (Athene cunicularia) were observed during the field survey. No potential cover sites for burrowing owls were present. The ongoing plowing would be expected to prevent sensitive wildlife species from moving into the study site. Trees within the northeast corner of the study area provide potential nesting sites for migratory birds to include Swainson’s hawk (Buteo swainsoni) and other raptor species. Swainson’s hawk have been documented nesting within a 5 mile radius of the study site. The study site appears to have no forage value for Swainson’s hawks. No Joshua tree (Yucca brevifolia), alkali mariposa lilies (Calochortus striatus), desert cymopterus (Cymopterus deserticola), Barstow woolly sunflowers (Eriophyllum mohanense) or other sensitive plants are expected to occur within the study area due to the high level of impacts and the lack of suitable habitat. No protection measures for sensitive plants are recommended. No other state or federally listed species are expected to occur within the proposed project area. No ephemeral washes or other water features were observed within the study site.

Recommended Protection Measures:

Prior to future potential development of this site the following are recommended.

If possible, removal of the trees and facilities will occur outside the breeding season for migratory birds. Breeding generally lasts from February to July but may extend beyond this time frame. If tree removal will occur during or close to the nesting season, a qualified biologist will survey all potential nesting areas to be disturbed as close as possible but no more than one week prior to removal. If active bird nests are found, impacts to nests will be avoided by either delaying work or establishing initial buffer areas of a minimum of 500 feet (152 m) around active raptor nests and 50 feet (15 m) around active passerine nests. The project biologist will determine if the buffer areas should be increased or decreased based on the nesting bird response to disturbances.
**Significance:** This project would not result in a significant adverse impact to biological resources with implementation of minimization measures.

Development has been proposed for APN 3170-014-014 (Figure 1). Development would include installation of access roads, parking, and utilities (water, sewer, electric, etc.). The entire project area would be regraded prior to construction activities.

An environmental analysis should be conducted prior to any development project. An assessment of biological resources is an integral part of environmental analyses (Gilbert and Dodds 1987). The purpose of this study was to provide an assessment of biological resources potentially occurring within or utilizing the proposed project area. Specific focus was on the presence/absence of rare, threatened and endangered species of plants and wildlife. Species of concern included the desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*), Mohave ground squirrel (*Xerospermophilus mohavensis*), burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), Swainson’s hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), desert kit fox (*Vulpes macrotis*), Joshua tree (*Yucca brevifolia*), desert cymopterus (*Cymopterus deserticola*), Barstow woolly sunflower (*Eriophyllum mohanense*), and alkali mariposa lily (*Calochortus striatus*).

**Study Area**

The approximately 40 acre (16 ha) study area was located north of Avenue M and east of 40th Street East, T7N, R11W, the SW1/4 of the SW1/4 of Section 33, S.B.B.M. (Figures 2 and 3). The southern boundary of the project site was formed by Avenue M/Columbia Way. Plant 42 and a highly disturbed field were present south of Avenue M. Dirt roads formed the northern and eastern boundaries of the study site. Active agricultural fields were present to the north and east of the study site. The western boundary was formed by 40th Street East. A solar array was present west of 40th Street East. Topography of the site ranged from approximately 2,470 to 2,475 feet (752 to 754 m) above sea level.

**Methods**

A line transect survey was conducted to inventory plant and wildlife species occurring within the proposed project area (Cooperrider et al. 1986, Davis 1990). The USFWS (2010) has provided recommendations for survey methodology to determine presence/absence and abundance/distribution of desert tortoises. Line transects were walked in a north-south orientation within the study site. Line transects ranged were approximately 1,320 feet (426 m) long and spaced approximately 100 feet (32 m) apart (U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service 2010). The California Department of Fish and Game (2012) prepared recommendations for burrowing owl survey methodology. Consistent with the survey protocol the entire site was surveyed, and adjacent areas were evaluated (CDFG 2012). A habitat assessment was conducted for Mohave ground squirrels (MGS) to determine whether potential habitat was present for the species (CDFW 2019). A habitat assessment was conducted for migratory birds to include Swainson’s hawk.
Figure 1. Location of proposed project site as depicted on APN map.
Figure 2. Approximate location of study area as depicted on U.S.G.S. Quadrangle, Lancaster East, Calif., 7.5’, 1974.
Figure 3. Approximate location of study area showing surrounding land use as depicted on excerpt from Google Earth Aerial Photography, 2018.
All observations of plant and animal species were recorded in field notes. Field guides were used to aid in the identification of plant and animal species (Arnett and Jacques 1981, Borror and White 1970, Burt and Grossenheider 1976, Gould 1981, Jaeger 1969, Knobel 1980, Robbins et al. 1983, Stark 2000). Observations were aided with the use of 10x42 binoculars. Observations of animal tracks, scat, and burrows were also utilized to determine the presence of wildlife species inhabiting the proposed project area (Cooperrider et al. 1986, Halfpenny 1986, Lowrey 2006, Murie 1974). Aerial photographs, California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB 2020), eBird 2022, reports from the area (Hagan 2020a-c, 2021, 2022), and the USGS topographic map were reviewed. Photographs of the study site were taken (Appendix A).

Results

A total of 12 line transects were walked on 31 July 2022. Weather conditions consisted of warm temperatures (estimated 75 degrees F), 90% cloud cover, and light wind. Sandy clay loam surface soil texture was present throughout the study area.

The proposed project area was characteristic of a fallow agricultural field with a home site and ancillary facilities in the northeast corner (Appendix A). A total of 11 plant species were observed during the line transect survey of the agricultural field (Table 1). The agricultural field was devoid of perennial shrubs. Russian thistle (*Salsola iberica*) was the dominant annual species throughout study site.

The homesite consisted of an occupied single family home, an abandoned house, and other small support facilities all positioned in proximity to one another. Ornamental landscaping was present within this home site with multiple large trees. No transects were completed within this area (very northeast corner) and plants within the homesite area were not documented except for trees and common sunflowers (*Helianthus annuus*) which could be observed from a distance. No Joshua trees, alkali mariposa lilies, Barstow woolly sunflowers, desert cymopterus, or suitable habitat were observed within the study site.

A total of 15 wildlife species, or their sign were observed during the line transect survey (Table 2). No desert tortoises or their sign were observed during the field survey. No burrowing owls or sign of occupation were observed within the study site. One inactive and deteriorating bird nest was observed through the open door in the abandoned house. No desert kit foxes or their sign were observed during the field survey. No suitable desert tortoise or MGS habitat was present within the study site.

A very small amount of scattered litter and debris were observed within the study site. One approximately 6 foot (1.8 m) abandoned pipe and associated infrastructure (Appendix A) was observed along the western boundary.
Table 1. List of plant species that were observed during the line transect survey of APN 3170-014-014, Lancaster, California.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American elm</td>
<td>Ulmus americana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiddleneck (small, few, along SW boundary)</td>
<td>Amsinckia tessellata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild morning glory</td>
<td>Convolvulus arvensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian thistle</td>
<td>Salsola iberica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puncture vine</td>
<td>Tribulus terrestris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda grass</td>
<td>Cynodon dactylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common sunflower (homesite garden)</td>
<td>Helianthus annuus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfalfa</td>
<td>Medicago sativa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumble mustard</td>
<td>Sisymbrium altississimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustard</td>
<td>Brassicaceae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheatgrass</td>
<td>Bromus tectorum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No list of plant species at homesite was made other than the sunflower and American elm.

Table 2. List of wildlife species, or their sign, that were observed during the line transect survey of APN 3170-014-014, Lancaster, California.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rodents (few, edges of S and W boundary)</td>
<td>Order: Rodentia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket gopher (few, edge SE corner)</td>
<td>Thomomys bottae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic dog</td>
<td>Canis familiaris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mourning dove</td>
<td>Zenaida macroura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern mockingbird</td>
<td>Mimus polyglottos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common raven</td>
<td>Corvus corax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House finch</td>
<td>Carpodacus mexicanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasshopper</td>
<td>Order: Orthoptera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragonfly</td>
<td>Order: Odonata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bee, black, large</td>
<td>Order: Hymenoptera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bee, black and gray, small</td>
<td>Order: Hymenoptera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European honey bees</td>
<td>Order: Hymenoptera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ants, small, black/red</td>
<td>Order: Hymenoptera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ants, small, black</td>
<td>Order: Hymenoptera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spider</td>
<td>Order: Araneida</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

It is likely that most annual species (other than agricultural crops) were visible during the time the field survey was performed. All of the annual biomass represented within the project site consisted of weedy species (Table 1). Based on the lack of habitat, no sensitive plant species are expected to exist within the study site. Although not observed, several wildlife species would be expected to occur within the proposed project area (Table 3).

Human impacts have eliminated all native habitat within this study site. Habitat in the general area is severely degraded, fragmented or already developed. If any burrowing animals are present within the proposed project area they are not expected to survive construction activities. Evidence of burrowing animals in the area was only observed along the edges of the southern and western boundaries near the roads. No burrows were observed within the agricultural field. No lagomorph (rabbits and hares) sign was observed and they are not expected. Birds are expected to survive, but they will have less cover and foraging habitat available.

The desert tortoise is a state endangered and federally threatened listed species. The proposed project area was located within the geographic range of the desert tortoise. The proposed project site was not located within critical habitat designated for the Mojave population of the desert tortoise. No desert tortoise habitat was present within, adjacent, or in proximity to the project site. Based on field observations, desert tortoises are not present within the study area. No protection measures are recommended for desert tortoises.

The MGS is a state listed threatened species. The study area was located within the geographic range of MGS. MGS habitat is recognized to consist of a variety of desert scrub habitats, none of which occur any longer within, adjacent, or in proximity to the project site. A table listing MGS habitats and a discussion of required shrubs and annuals can be found in the publication titled “A Conservation Strategy for the Mohave Ground Squirrel” (CDFW 2019). No suitable habitat was present to support MGS within or around this study site. No protection measures are recommended for MGS.

Desert kit foxes are a fully protected species by California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). No sign of desert kit fox activity was observed within the study site. Based on this field survey desert kit foxes are not resident within this study site. No protection measures are recommended for desert kit foxes.

Many species of birds and their active nests are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. The urban landscaping, and facilities within the study area offer nesting and foraging habitat for migratory birds. The agricultural field may offer some limited foraging habitat but would not be suitable nesting habitat due to the ongoing land disturbance. No rodent and low insect sign were observed during the field survey. In addition to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, some species of birds have added protection through state and federal listings and rules.
Table 3. List of wildlife species that may occur within the study area, APN 3170-014-014, Lancaster, California.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deer mouse</td>
<td><em>Peromyscus maniculatus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic cat</td>
<td><em>Felis catus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red tail hawk</td>
<td><em>Buteo jamaicensis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock dove</td>
<td><em>Columba livia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House sparrow</td>
<td><em>Passer domesticus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly</td>
<td>Order: Diptera</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Swainson’s hawk is a state listed threatened species. Suitable nesting habitat is present within the northeast corner homesite and immediately southeast of the homesite. Swainson’s hawk observations within east Lancaster have been strongly correlated to active agricultural fields, away from residential tracts (eBird 2022, CNDDB 2020). CDFW considers impacts to a Swainson’s hawk, as well as impacts to suitable habitat within 5 miles of an active nest, if it would lead to a significant impact to the species survival or to the survival of nestlings is considered a potential take by the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). Swainson’s hawks have been observed nest building at 50th Street East and Avenue L and at 50th Street East and Avenue N in 2020 (eBird 2022). The study site appears to have no foraging habitat for Swainson’s hawks due to a lack of prey base. However, active agricultural fields are adjacent to both the northern and eastern boundaries of the study site. Additional suitable potential nesting trees are also present to the southeast of the study site.

Burrowing owls are considered a species of special concern by the CDFW. Review of the CNDDB and eBird indicated no observations within proximity to the study site. The presence of domestic dogs (*Canis familiaris*), active agricultural activities within the study site, and the low prey base would not be conducive to burrowing owl residency. No protection measures for burrowing owls are recommended.

No suitable habitat for Joshua trees, alkali mariposa lily, Barstow woolly sunflower or desert cymopterus was observed within the study site. Based on the results of the field survey these species are not expected to occur within the study area and no protection measures are recommended. No other state or federally listed threatened or endangered species are expected to occur within the proposed project area (California Department of Fish and Wildlife 2020, 2021, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service 2016).

Landscape design should incorporate the use of native plants to the maximum extent feasible. Native plants that have food and cover value to wildlife should be used in landscape design (Adams and Dove 1989). Diversity of native plants should be maximized in landscape design (Adams and Dove 1989).
**Recommended Protection Measures:**

Prior to future potential development of this site the following are recommended.

If possible, removal of the trees and facilities will occur outside the breeding season for migratory birds. Breeding generally lasts from February to July but may extend beyond this time frame. If tree removal will occur during or close to the nesting season, a qualified biologist will survey all potential nesting areas to be disturbed as close as possible but no more than one week prior to removal. If active bird nests are found, impacts to nests will be avoided by either delaying work or establishing initial buffer areas of a minimum of 500 feet (152 m) around active raptor nests and 50 feet (15 m) around active passerine nests. The project biologist will determine if the buffer areas should be increased or decreased based on the nesting bird response to disturbances.

**Significance:** This project would not result in a significant adverse impact to biological resources with implementation of minimization measures.

**Literature Cited**


eBird. 2022. eBird: An online database of bird distribution and abundance [web application].
(Accessed: August 2, 2022)
Gilbert, F.F. and D.G. Dodds. 1987. The philosophy and practice of wildlife
Tucson, AZ. 343pp.
Hagan, M. 2021. Update to the 2005 “biological resources assessment of tentative tract number
Hagan, M. 2022. Biological resource assessment of apns 3384-001-001, 002, and 003, lancaster,
375pp.
Stark, M. 2000. A flower-watchers guide to wildflowers of the western mojave desert
Published by Milt Stark. Lancaster, CA. 160pp.
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. 2016. Listed species believed to or known to occur in California.
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. 2010. Preparing for any action that may occur within the range of
the Mojave desert tortoise (gopherus agassizii), 2010 field season. U.S. Fish & Wildl.
Serv. 16pp.
Appendix A. Representative Photographs of Study Site
Closer aerial of study site.
View from the northeast corner looking southwest.

View from the northwest corner looking southeast. Trees on far left are within the northeast corner of the study site; the rest are off site.
View from approximately the center of the southern boundary looking toward the north.

View from approximately the center of the western boundary looking toward the east.
House, ancillary facilities, and garden in the northeast corner of the study site.
Abandoned pipe (approximately 6 foot) within western boundary.
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SUMMARY

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended, and the requirements of the City of Palmdale, a phase I cultural resource investigation was undertaken for a 40-acre property located at the northeast corner of the the intersection of 40th Street East and East Avenue M. The property is recorded with the Los Angeles County Tax Assessor as APN 3170-014-014. The property is located within the southwest 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of Section 33, Township 7 North, Range 11 West.

The purpose of this study was to identify cultural resources within the subject property and recommend mitigation measures, as warranted. The scope of the investigation included an on-foot inspection of the property, a review of the literature and records, a sacred lands file search, preparation and filing of record forms as specified by the Office of Historic Preservation Guidelines, and preparation of a phase I report.

As a result of the investigation, no Native American sites or artifacts were identified on the property. One historic period site was identified. It consists of a farm residential compound with a house and outbuildings built between 1940 and 1947. It was determined to be not significant. Since no significant cultural resources were identified, no impacts to significant cultural resources are anticipated due to any future use or development of the property. No further cultural resource work is recommended.
I. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended, and the requirements of the City of Palmdale, a phase I cultural resource investigation was undertaken for a 40-acre property located at the northeast corner of the intersection of 40th Street East and East Avenue M. The property is recorded with the Los Angeles County Tax Assessor as APN 3170-014-014. The property is located within the southwest 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of Section 33, Township 7 North, Range 11 West (Figures 1, 2).

CEQA defines cultural resources as including archaeological sites, historic buildings, structures or objects, and properties of unique ethnic or cultural value or religious/sacred uses. The City of Palmdale required this study, under CEQA, because use or construction on the property has the potential to cause a "substantial adverse change" to any cultural resources that might be present.

The purpose of the study was to identify cultural resources within the subject property and recommend further mitigation measures, as warranted. The scope of the investigation included an on-foot inspection of the property; a review of records, maps and literature; a sacred lands file search, preparation and filing of any necessary record forms as specified by the Office of Historic Preservation Guidelines and preparation of a phase I report.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The property is situated on the Antelope Valley floor. The Antelope Valley is a broad, flat V-shaped basin in the Western Mojave Desert. The Valley is bounded on the north by the Tehachapi Mountains and on the south by the San Gabriel Mountains and extends eastward to the Mojave River Valley. Low points in the Antelope Valley are Rogers and Rosamond Dry Lakes with elevations of approximately 2275 feet above mean sea level. The subject property lies south of Rosamond Dry Lake and its elevation is approximately 2470 feet above mean sea level.

The property is level and mostly consists of a fallow farm field with east/west trending plow furrows. There is a compound with a residential structure, shade trees and outbuildings in the northeast corner of the property. The property is bounded in the west by 40th Street East, by East Avenue M to the south and by dirt access roads along the east and north to the east and north boundaries. There is a large agricultural development on neighboring property adjacent to the northeast corner of the property.

Native vegetation is lacking. All of Section 33 is characterized by scattered farm fields and farm residences. Lands to the immediate west consist of the Arrache 8083 solar farm. In earlier times before agricultural development these areas were probably Joshua tree woodland. Soil on the property is quaternary in age and is a well-drained gravelly sandy silt. There are no notable physiographic features, rock outcrops, springs, or other permanent sources of water on or adjacent to the property.
Figure 1: Project location depicted on Palmdale, California USGS map of 01 July 1975 via Microsoft Terra Server

1" = about 7.5 miles
III. CULTURAL SETTING

The Antelope Valley has a cultural history extending back over 10,000 years and this history is represented by thousands of archaeological and historic period sites. Most of the prehistoric periods are known only in general outline. As would be expected the later periods are the best known. General temporal and cultural sequences have been developed by a number of researchers for other areas of the Mojave Desert including Wallace (1962), Bettinger and Taylor (1974), Stickle and Weinman-Roberts (1980), Warren and Crabtree (1986), and Earle, et. al., (1997).

Local prehistoric cultural history can be classified into four periods: Early, Middle, Late and Post-Contact (Norwood 1987). These periods were created to recognize change in environmental variables, technological and stylistic change, and/or settlement pattern changes. The ethnography of the Antelope Valley floor is poorly known. Various Indian groups, including the Kitanemuk, Kawaiisu and Serrano/Vanyume, may have been present in the area. These people were hunters and gatherers with an intimate knowledge of local floral and faunal resources and were able to obtain and prepare them for food and other products. The ethnography of the Valley is discussed by Kroeber (1925), Bean and Smith (1978), Blackburn and Bean (1978), Sutton (1980), Zigmon (1986), and Earle (1996).

The historical context of the region is discussed in several publications including those by Starr (1988), Morris (1977), Earle, et. al. (1998), and Earle (1998). Also, a series of publications by the Kern-Antelope Historical Society and the West Antelope Valley Historical Society contain historical essays and interviews that are valuable for understanding the development of local historical context.

Prior to the last part of the 19th century, the history of the Antelope Valley is characterized primarily by people's efforts to pass through the Valley. Activity within the Valley was largely limited to cattle grazing, prospecting and hunting expeditions. Historic development of the Valley really began after the 1876 establishment of the Southern Pacific Railroad linking Los Angeles with the San Joaquin Valley. The mid-1880s brought the first actual land boom. This period saw the establishment of a number of settlements in the Valley and many settlers began successful orchards and small farms. There was a great deal of speculation and a variety of questionable schemes were used to entice people into the Valley.

Following this period the fortunes of the Valley were greatly altered by natural causes. In 1894, a 10-year drought began that devastated many settlers who had little practical knowledge or appreciation of the desert environment. These people lost crop after crop and eventually their homes and land. At the turn-of-the-century, much of the Valley was considered worthless and the ownership of many parcels reverted to the state. A reduced population of die-hards remained, some of whom were favored with land having a high water table and productive agricultural soil. The history of the earlier periods of occupation are, as would be expected, less clear than later periods, because there was an exodus of people and loss of records. There is still much to learn about the dynamics of
local development prior to 1920-1925.

Worldwide during the same period many technological innovations were being introduced. In 1904, a gasoline engine was first used in the Valley to pump well water. By 1908-1914 there was an influx of people into the Valley due to the construction of the Los Angeles aqueduct. By 1904 improved conditions after the drought, improved irrigation techniques and increasing subsistence diversity enhanced the potential for economic success. Construction of an aqueduct for the Los Angeles basin between 1908-1914 brought people back into the Valley. The World War I and post-war periods brought another influx of people as homesteading reached a peak of popularity and agricultural prices were relatively high.

By 1914, electricity was introduced to the Valley and by 1917 the introduction of electric water pumps and improved dry farming techniques resulted in the substantial growth and success of agriculture. Increased prices for agricultural produce during World War I stimulated additional growth and agricultural expansion. Other economic endeavors, such as poultry ranching and, after 1919, moonshining, became important economic drivers. By the mid-1920s Palmdale and Lancaster had assumed the characteristics and social institutions of small American rural towns of the period. World War II brought growth and radical change with the establishment of Edwards Air Force Base and the aerospace industry at Plant 42 in Palmdale.

IV. RECORD MAP AND SACRED LANDS FILE SEARCH RESULTS

Record search: Background research was performed by reviewing previous studies, historic period maps, and early land records. The subject property is close to the boundary with east Lancaster. Most previous studies have been accomplished in the more developed areas of Palmdale and Lancaster. The resources in nearby areas to the north of the subject property in Lancaster are described and discussed in Lancaster’s General Plan Update (Tang, Hogan and Smallwood 2006). The most common types of resources found in this region consist of historic period refuse deposits, farm homes and compounds, wells, irrigation ponds and other agricultural features. Extensive farming and plowing, over the many decades since European settlement have made substantial intact prehistoric Native American sites uncommon in the area.

The most extensive previous studies nearby was done within Air Force Plant 42 to the immediate south of the subject property. Plant 42 was established in 1942 and it controls approximately 5,800 acres. Much of its construction occurred before the National Historic Preservation Act was passed in 1966. However, cultural resource surveys have been accomplished for some remaining undeveloped areas within Plant 42. In 1993 (McKenna et. al, 1993) recorded a lithic scatter within the northwest corner of Plant 42. Later work by Earthtech (2004) recorded a series of historic period refuse deposits and a World War II period gunnery range.

Map Search: Local historic period maps were reviewed to identify any potential historic sites or features on or near the property. Findings are discussed below.
1911: The earliest regional map of Lancaster is Johnson's (1911) Water Supply map showing well locations throughout Lancaster and the surrounding area. Data for this map is based on a 1909 field survey. His map reflects no historic period activity in or near the subject property or anywhere within Section 33.

1915: The 1915 Lake Elizabeth 15' USGS quad map shows no structures anywhere within Section 33. It does show a diagonal dirt road through the section north of the subject property.

1922: By 1920-1925 Lancaster had matured into a small town characteristic of the period. Carpenter and Cosby's Soil Survey map (1926), based on a 1922 field survey, shows no structures within Section 33.

1933: The 1930 edition of the Tierra Bonita 7.5' USGS map shows no structures anywhere within the section.

1958: The Lancaster East 1950s era USGS map shows a scattering of structures within Section 33. Three structures are shown on the subject property.

GLO Records: The Bureau of Land Management General Land Office Records were checked for historic period transactions. All of Section 33 was granted to the Southern Pacific Railroad on 3/27/1915. Parcels were later sold off to private parties.

**Sacred lands file search:** Native American resources have not been identified within this section of Palmdale. Attachment 1 of this report shows the results of a sacred lands file check by the Native American Heritage Commission. No sacred sites are on file for the property. A list of Native American contacts who may have an interest in this project or be able to provide additional information was provided.

V. **SURVEY METHODS AND CONDITIONS**

Field survey for the property was completed on June 30 and July 1, 2022 by Melinda Walton representing RTFactfinders. Fieldwork required 16 person-hours. The property was systematically surveyed using 8-10-meter intervals and east/west oriented linear transects. The survey was begun at the southwest property corner. Visibility was excellent with bright sun and light winds. Surface visibility was excellent with minimal vegetation cover. Photos were taken to document property conditions and finds (Attachment 2). There were no inhibiting conditions that would prevent the detection of surface evidence of cultural resources. In accordance with State Historic Preservation Office Guidelines any sites or artifacts greater than 50 years of age, if present, were to be noted and considered as potential cultural resources.

VI. **SURVEY FINDINGS**

No Native American sites or artifacts were identified on the property. One historic period
site was found and recorded with the temporary designation Site 664-1. The site consists of a residential compound with outbuildings and shade trees. Tax records indicate construction dates between 1940 and 1947 thus the compound and its various features exceed 50 years of age. Three major structures are shown on the 1958 USGS map and three are shown on the aerial photos available on the Los Angeles County Tax Assessor web page. The structures are situated in a north/south trending alignment (Attachment 3).

Feature 1 is an abandoned farm office building. This building’s footprint measures approximately 20 feet by 40 feet. It is a stucco-finished wood-frame one story structure with doors facing west and north. The structure has broken windows with the doors mostly intact. The structure contains some abandoned furniture including a desk and refrigerator. The structure is in poor condition. There is a substantial concrete slab adjacent to the east side of the structure. It connects Features 2 and 3.

Feature 2: The feature is a concrete pad flush to the ground with an inset strip of steel framing it. It looks like a vehicle scale. It is just north of the farm office building. It may have been used to weigh in/out produce trucks.

Feature 3: This feature is a concentration of stacks of ceramic roofing tiles southeast of Feature 1. They appear to be used and were probably salvaged from another structure. The tiles cover an area of roughly 20 feet by 10 feet.

Feature 4: This feature is a detached one car garage or shed. It measures approximately 10 feet by 20 feet and is a wood framed structure with corrugated steel wall cladding. It lies just south of the roof tile storage area.

Feature 5: This feature is a currently occupied residence. It is similar in terms of age and construction to Feature 1. It is estimated to be about 1000 square feet. It is a stuccoed one-story wood frame structure with a composition roof. It is surrounded with a chain link fence.

Feature 6: Garden and previous structure location. The 1958 USGS map and earlier aerial maps show a structure at this location. It appears to have been an additional residential structure, but it has since been either moved or demolished. Currently there is an extensive lawn and garden in its place.

VII. MANAGEMENT CONCERNS

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) has provisions to ensure that any cultural resources identified during the environmental review process need to be evaluated for significance, because unique or important resources require mitigation. To determine if mitigation is required, evaluation is required to assess a resource’s significance in terms of National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or CEQA criteria.

Site 664-1: The residential compound dates between the 1940-1947 time period making it at least 75 years of age so it must be considered for significance. This resource is
considered under the NRHP criteria (A, B, C, D), for attaining eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places. Eligible sites are those:

A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

B. That are associated with the lives of significant persons in our past.

C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

D. That have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

The residential compound cannot be considered to be closely associated with the broad patterns of our history except in a very general way. There are similar compounds throughout the Antelope Valley and this site is not an especially notable one because it is missing a structure and the remaining structures are not in good condition. The compound can not be associated with the lives of past significant persons. The compound does not meet any characteristic stated in criterion C, which typically is applied to buildings and structures. The structures are not unique or architecturally distinctive. The compound is not likely to yield information important in history because it any buried materials it may contain are not likely to pre-date 1940, a period well documented in the Antelope Valley. Therefore, the compound is considered not eligible to the National Register, hence, for the purposes of CEQA, is considered not significant.

Since no Native American or significant historic period cultural resources were identified on the property, no impacts to significant cultural resources are anticipated when development occurs. No further cultural resource measures are recommended.

While unlikely, potentially significant buried material could exist on the property. Under CEQA "inadvertent finds" (unexpected buried sites found after completion of a phase I or II study as a result of construction exposure) are subject to evaluation and, if significant, appropriate impact mitigation. In the event unanticipated cultural materials (arrowheads, grinding stones, etc.) or features (old foundations, cellars, privy pits, etc.) are encountered during any future excavation work, the work must stop at the discovery site. A professional cultural resource consultant will need to evaluate the buried find.

In the event any bones of possible human origin are uncovered, during any future construction, the Los Angeles County Coroner must be notified and permitted to investigate the find prior to any further disturbance at the location of discovery.
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ATTACHMENT 1
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

July 20, 2022

Richard Norwood
R1Factsfinders

Via Email to: artefct@gmail.com

Re: 664 40 Acre Commercial Project, Los Angeles County

Dear Mr. Norwood:

A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was completed for the information you have submitted for the above referenced project. The results were negative. However, the absence of specific site information in the SLF does not indicate the absence of cultural resources in any project area. Other sources of cultural resources should also be contacted for information regarding known and recorded sites.

Attached is a list of Native American tribes who may also have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. This list should provide a starting place in locating areas of potential adverse impact within the proposed project area. I suggest you contact all of those indicated; if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. By contacting all those listed, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult with the appropriate tribe. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the Commission requests that you follow-up with a telephone call or email to ensure that the project information has been received.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from tribes, please notify me. With your assistance, we can assure that our lists contain current information.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at my email address: Andrew.Green@nahc.ca.gov

Sincerely,

Andrew Green
Cultural Resources Analyst

Attachment
Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians
Jairo Avila, Tribal Historic and Cultural Preservation Officer
1019 Second Street, Suite 1
San Fernando, CA, 91340
Phone: (818) 837 - 0794
Fax: (818) 837-0798
jairo.avila@tataviam-nsn.us

San Fernando Band of Mission Indians
Donna Yocum, Chairperson
P.O. Box 221838
Newhall, CA, 91322
Phone: (503) 539 - 0933
Fax: (503) 574-3308
ddyocum@comcast.net

Morongo Band of Mission Indians
Ann Brierty, THPO
12700 Pumarra Road
Banning, CA, 92220
Phone: (951) 755 - 5259
Fax: (951) 572-6004
abrierty@morongo-nsn.gov

San Manuel Band of Mission Indians
Jessica Mauck, Director of Cultural Resources
28569 Community Center Drive
Highland, CA, 92346
Phone: (909) 864 - 8933
Jessica.Mauck@sanmanuel-nsn.gov

Serrano Nation of Mission Indians
Wayne Walker, Co-Chairperson
P. O. Box 343
Patton, CA, 92369
Phone: (253) 370 - 0167
serranonation1@gmail.com

Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation
Manfred Scott, Acting Chairman
Kw'Is'an Cultural Committee
P.O. Box 1899
Yuma, AZ, 85366
Phone: (928) 750 - 2516
scottmanfred@yahoo.com

Serrano Nation of Mission Indians
Mark Cochrane, Co-Chairperson
P. O. Box 343
Patton, CA, 92369
Phone: (909) 528 - 9032
serranonation1@gmail.com

Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation
Jill McCormick, Historic Preservation Officer
P.O. Box 1899
Yuma, AZ, 85366
Phone: (760) 572 - 2423
historicpreservation@quechantribe.com

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7030.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5007.94 of the Public Resource Section 5007.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed 684 40 Acre Commercial Project, Los Angeles County.
PHOTO 1: View northeast from the southwest property corner.

PHOTO 2: View southwest, Feature 1 (building), Feature 2 (right), Feature 3 (left).
PHOTO 3: View south, Feature 3, features 4 and 5 in background.

PHOTO 4: View southwest, Feature 4.
PHOTO 5: View west, structure location and lawn/garden, south of Feature 5.

PHOTO 6: View northeast, Feature 5 to the right, Feature 1 to the left.
NOTE: Include bar scale and north arrow.
### CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUL-1: Inadvertent Discovery of Archaeological Resources.</td>
<td>If archaeological resources are encountered during implementation of the Project, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) shall cease and a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall be hired to assess the find. Work on the other portions of the project outside of the buffered area may continue during this assessment period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUL-2: Human Remains.</td>
<td>If human remains or funerary objects are encountered during any activities associated with the project, work in the immediate vicinity (within a 100-foot buffer of the find) shall cease and the County Coroner shall be contacted pursuant to State Health and Safety Code §7050.5 and that code enforced for the duration of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Timing:** During development  
**Implementing Entity:** Developer will include as part of construction contract/specifications.  
**Monitoring Agency:** City of Palmdale Planning Department or it’s designee

### GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEO-1: Inadvertent Discovery of Paleontological Resources.</td>
<td>If paleontological resources are encountered during implementation of the Project, ground-disturbing activities will be temporarily redirected from the vicinity of the find. A qualified paleontologist (the “Project Paleontologist”) shall be retained by the developer to make an evaluation of the find. If the resource is significant, Mitigation Measure GEO-2 shall apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO-2: Paleontological Treatment Plan.</td>
<td>If a significant paleontological resource(s) is discovered on the property, in consultation with the Project proponent and the City, the qualified paleontologist shall develop a plan of mitigation which shall include salvage excavation and removal of the find, removal of sediment from around the specimen (in the laboratory), research to identify and categorize the find, curation in the find a local qualified repository, and preparation of a report summarizing the find.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**  

**Mitigation Measure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best management practices as required by both NPDES and the SWPPP will be accomplished through implementation of the following measures.</th>
<th>WQ-1 Prior to issuance of a grading permit the applicant shall obtain coverage under the statewide general NPDES permit for control of construction and post-construction related storm water in accordance with the requirements of the Small MS4 General Permit. In addition, the applicant shall:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare a project specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) as required in the NPDES permit and shall identify site-specific erosion and sediment control best management practices that will be implemented;</td>
<td>• Prepare a project specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) as required in the NPDES permit and shall identify site-specific erosion and sediment control best management practices that will be implemented;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The SWPPP shall be applicable to all areas of the project site including construction areas, access roads to and through the site, and staging and stockpile areas;</td>
<td>• The SWPPP shall be applicable to all areas of the project site including construction areas, access roads to and through the site, and staging and stockpile areas;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Temporary best management practices for all components of the project must be implemented until such time as permanent post-construction best management practices are in place and functioning; and</td>
<td>• Temporary best management practices for all components of the project must be implemented until such time as permanent post-construction best management practices are in place and functioning; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All excess sediment excavated as part of the Project that is not used onsite should be stockpiled in a location such that it will not be transported by wind or water into a surface water. An adequate combination of sediment and erosion control BMPs must be implemented and maintained to temporarily stabilize all stockpiled sediment until such time that it is reused and/or permanently stabilized.</td>
<td>• All excess sediment excavated as part of the Project that is not used onsite should be stockpiled in a location such that it will not be transported by wind or water into a surface water. An adequate combination of sediment and erosion control BMPs must be implemented and maintained to temporarily stabilize all stockpiled sediment until such time that it is reused and/or permanently stabilized.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WQ-2** The applicant/developer shall prepare and implement a comprehensive Spill Prevention and Response Plan for the Project, subject to review and approval by the City Planner and City Engineer (or their designee) prior to the issuance of any associated building or grading permit. This plan should outline the site-specific monitoring requirements and list the best management practices necessary to prevent hazardous material spills or to contain and cleanup a hazardous material spill, should one occur.

**Timing:** Prior to and during development  
**Implementing Entity:** Developer will include as part of construction contract/specifications. Lahontan Water Quality Control Board (permits)  
**Monitoring Agency:** City of Palmdale Planning Department or it’s designee