STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: *03-170*
CASES: *CUP*

*** * * * INITIAL STUDY * * * ***

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: *February 1999* Staff Member: *Christina D. Tran*
Thomas Guide: *3926 A, B, C – 5 & 6* USGS Quad: *Lancaster East*
Location: *600 East Avenue F, Lancaster*

Description of Project: *New CUP application for the expansion of an existing Class III non- hazardous solid waste landfill and recycling center (CUP 93070) to increase the allowable daily intake volume from 1,700 tons per day (tpd) that is currently permitted to 3,000 tpd. The landfill area encompasses a 256-acre refuse disposal footprint and a 20-acre area that is occupied by facilities that are ancillary to the landfill. No new improvements or modifications are proposed to the existing facility. Operating hours will be from 5:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., Monday – Saturday, with a maximum of 16 employees working one shift.*

Gross Acres: *276 acres*

Environmental Setting: *Project site is currently used as a landfill and recycling center with 2.9 acres covered by structures including a ticket office, maintenance buildings, employee facilities, a paint shop, and container repair shop that are ancillary facilities. Immediate surrounding land use consists of vacant land. Nearest residences are approximately 0.5 mile west of the project site. Land uses to the north and northeast of the site include open space, scattered single-family residences approximately 1 ½ mile from the site, Piute Ponds and the southern boundary of Edwards Air Force Base.*

Zoning: *D-2-1 (Desert/Mountain – 1 acre minimum)*
General Plan: *Non-urban*
Community/Area wide Plan: *Non-urban 1 to .5 dwelling per acre (Antelope Valley Areawide GP)*

Major projects in area:

PROJECT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION & STATUS
CP99096	*RV Park, rec. room & general store (1-17-01 approved)*

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

Responsible Agencies	Special Reviewing Agencies	Regional Significance
☐ None	☐ None	☒ None
☒ Regional Water Quality Control Board	☐ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy	☐ SCAG Criteria
☐ Los Angeles Region	☐ National Parks	☐ Air Quality
☒ Lahontan Region	☐ National Forest	☐ Water Resources
☐ Coastal Commission	☐ Edwards Air Force Base	☐ Santa Monica Mtns. Area
☐ Army Corps of Engineers	☐ Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mtns. Area	☐
☒ *Caltrans*	☒ *City of Lancaster*	☐
☒ *CA Integrated Waste Management Board*	☒ *AQMD*	☐
Trustee Agencies	☒ *City of Palmdale*	**County Reviewing Agencies**
☐ None	☒ *Kern County*	☐ Subdivision Committee
☒ State Fish and Game	☒ *Edwards Air Force Base*	☒ DPW: *Traffic & Lighting; Watershed Management (and NPDES Section); Environmental Programs; Waste Management Division; Geotechnical and Materials Engineering Division, Drainage & Grading*
☐ State Parks	☐	☒ Health Services: *Solid Waste Management Program; Rural Mountain*
☐	☐	☒ Fire Department
☐	☐	☒ County Sanitation Districts

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)				
			Less than Significant Impact/No Impact			
				Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation		
					Potentially Significant Impact	
CATEGORY	**FACTOR**	Pg				Potential Concern
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Flood	6	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Fire	7	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Noise	8	☐	☐	☒	*Increased truck traffic and operation*
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	☐	☐	☒	*Increased daily intake volume*
	2. Air Quality	10	☐	☐	☒	*Hazardous emissions*
	3. Biota	11	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Cultural Resources	12	☒	☐	☐	
	5. Mineral Resources	13	☒	☐	☐	
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	☒	☐	☐	
	7. Visual Qualities	15	☒	☐	☐	
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	☐	☐	☒	*Increased truck trips*
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Education	18	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	☒	☐	☐	
	5. Utilities	20	☐	☐	☒	*Increased water usage for dust control*
OTHER	1. General	21	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Environmental Safety	22	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Land Use	23	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	☒	☐	☐	
	5. Mandatory Findings	25	☐	☐	☒	*Traffic, noise, air quality, water quality*

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS* shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

1. Development Policy Map Designation: *Other Non-urban & Agricultural*
2. ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
3. ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

☐ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of printout: _____

☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

☐ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

☐ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

☒ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant".

☒ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: _____ Date: _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

☐ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filling fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%?
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
h.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Sections 308B, 309, 310, and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

Analyzed in DEIR of April 1997 for project #93070

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No Impact

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site? *Drainage course traverse a small corner of the property to the east*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone? *Drainage course traverse a small corner of the property to the east*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?
f.	☐	☐	☒	Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? *Dam or debris basin flood boundaries*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Section 308A ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)

☐ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

Analyzed in DEIR of April 1997 for project #93070

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☐ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☐ Fire Regulation No. 8
☐ Fuel Modification / Landscape Plan

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

No new improvements proposed; analyzed in DEIR of April 1997 for project #93070

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?
c.	☒	☐	☐	Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project? *Increased truck traffic, trash compactors, loaders, bulldozers, scrapers, etc.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?
e.	☒	☐	☐	Other factors? *Equipment noise levels range from approximately 70 dBA to over 100 dBA at a Distance of 50 feet from operating equipments*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Noise Control (Title 12 – Chapter 8) ☐ Uniform Building Code (Title 26 - Chapter 35)

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells? *Existing water well*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system? *Existing septic system*
	☐	☒	☐	If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations *or* is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?
c.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies? *Landfills are subject to NPDES requirements*
d.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies? *Landfills are subject to NPDES requirements*
e.	☒	☐	☐	Other factors? *Landfill and waste materials*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Industrial Waste Permit
☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269
☐ Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5
☒ NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**
☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **water quality** problems?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?
c.	☐	☐	☒	Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook? *Request 75% increase in daily capacity*
d.	☒	☐	☐	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions? *Open landfill*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
g.	☒	☐	☐	Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? *Increase in operation from 1,700 tpd to 3,000 tpd*
h.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Health and Safety Code – Section 40506

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Project Design ☐ Air Quality Report

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **air quality**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located within Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?
c.	☒	☐	☐	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue dashed line, located on the project site? *Unnamed drainage course*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g. coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian, woodland, wetland, etc.)?
e.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)? *Approximately 150 Joshua trees*
f.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)? *Mojave ground squirrels, desert tortoise*
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ ERB/SEATAC Review ☐ Oak Tree Permit

Analyzed in DEIR of April 1997 for project #93070

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, **biotic** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological/Historical/Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity? *Unnamed drainage course traverse a corner of property to the east*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Phase 1 Archaeology Report

Analyzed in DEIR of April 1997 for project #93070

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical**, or **paleontological** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 5.Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project 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?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project 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?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?
d.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Visual Report ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?
e.	☒	☐	☐	Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded? *Truck trips related to increase in daily volume intake from 1,700 tpd to 3,000 tpd*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)?
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design ☐ Traffic Report ☐ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **traffic/access** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Private septic system; no new improvements proposed

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 3. Education

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create student transportation problems?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Site Dedication ☐ Government Code Section 65995 ☐ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Fire Mitigation Fee

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells? *No public water*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs? *No public water*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?
f.	☒	☐	☐	Other factors? *Increased water usage for dust control, compaction, and irrigation*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269 ☐ Water Code – Ordinance No. 7834

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities** services?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?
d.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site? *Paint, gasoline, diesel fuel, oil, hydraulic fluid*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site? *Acetylene and oxygen tanks, propane tanks*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?
d.	☒	☐	☐	Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site? *50 years of landfill use*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?
h.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?
i.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
j.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ Toxic Clean-up Plan

☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Hazardous materials will not exceed the maximum amounts established for the site – landfill is lined

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?
c.				Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
	☐	☒	☐	Hillside Management Criteria?
	☐	☒	☐	SEA Conformance Criteria?
	☐	☐	☐	Other?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project physically divide an established community?
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment,** or **recreational** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, 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?
b.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual 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. *Traffic, air quality, water quality, water supply, noise*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact