

1. Executive Summary

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) addresses the environmental effects associated with the implementation of the proposed Antelope Valley Area Plan (Proposed Project). The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that local government agencies, prior to taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority, consider the environmental consequences of such projects. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is a public document designed to provide the public, and local and state governmental-agency decision makers, with an analysis of potential environmental consequences to support informed decision making.

This DEIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA as set forth in the Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., and the State CEQA Guidelines, 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq. (CEQA Guidelines). The County of Los Angeles, as the lead agency, has reviewed and revised as necessary all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports to reflect its own independent judgment, including reliance on applicable County technical personnel from other departments and review of all technical subconsultant reports.

Data for this DEIR was obtained from field observations, discussions with affected agencies, analysis of adopted plans and policies, review of available studies, reports, data and similar literature, and specialized environmental assessments (air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, transportation and traffic).

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

This DEIR has been prepared pursuant to CEQA to assess the environmental effects associated with implementation of the Proposed Project, as well as anticipated future discretionary actions and approvals. The six main objectives of this document as established by CEQA are listed below:

- 1) To disclose to decision makers and the public the significant environmental effects of proposed activities.
- 2) To identify ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage.
- 3) To prevent environmental damage by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures.
- 4) To disclose to the public reasons for agency approval of projects with significant environmental effects.
- 5) To foster interagency coordination in the review of projects.
- 6) To enhance public participation in the planning process.

1. Executive Summary

An EIR is the most comprehensive form of environmental documentation identified in CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines and provides the information needed to assess the environmental consequences of a proposed project, to the extent feasible. EIRs are intended to provide an objective, factually supported, full-disclosure analysis of the environmental consequences associated with a proposed project that has the potential to result in significant, adverse environmental impacts.

An EIR is also one of various decision-making tools used by a lead agency to consider the merits and disadvantages of a project that is subject to its discretionary authority. Prior to approving a proposed project, the lead agency must consider the information contained in the EIR, determine whether the EIR was properly prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, determine that it reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency, adopt findings concerning the project's significant environmental impacts and alternatives, and must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations if the proposed project would result in significant impacts that cannot be avoided.

1.2.1 EIR Organization

This DEIR has been organized as described below.

Section 1. Executive Summary: Summarizes the background and description of the Proposed Project, the format of this EIR, project alternatives, any critical issues remaining to be resolved, and the potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures identified for the Proposed Project.

Section 2. Introduction: Describes the purpose of this EIR, background on the Proposed Project, the Notice of Preparation, the use of incorporation by reference, and Final EIR certification.

Section 3. Project Description: A detailed description of the project, the objectives of the Proposed Project, the Project Area and location, approvals anticipated to be included as part of the project, the necessary environmental clearances for the project, and the intended uses of this EIR.

Section 4. Environmental Setting: A description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the Proposed Project as they existed at the time the Notice of Preparation was published, from both a local and regional perspective. The environmental setting provides baseline physical conditions from which the lead agency determines the significance of environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project.

Section 5. Environmental Analysis: Provides, for each environmental parameter analyzed, a description of the thresholds used to determine if a significant impact would occur; the methodology to identify and evaluate the potential impacts of the Proposed Project; the existing environmental setting; the potential adverse and beneficial effects of the Proposed Project; the level of impact significance before mitigation; the mitigation measures for the Proposed Project; the level of significance of the adverse impacts of the Proposed Project after mitigation is incorporated and the potential cumulative impacts associated with the Proposed Project and other existing, approved, and proposed development in the area.

Section 6. Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts: Describes the significant unavoidable adverse impacts of the Proposed Project.

1. Executive Summary

Section 7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project: Describes the impacts of the alternatives to the Proposed Project, including the No Project/Adopted Area Plan Alternative, Reduced Intensity Alternative, and Alternative Land Use Policy Map.

Section 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant: Briefly describes the potential impacts of the Proposed Project that were determined not to be significant by the Notice of Preparation and were therefore not discussed in detail in this EIR.

Section 9. Significant Irreversible Changes Due to the Proposed Project: Describes the significant irreversible environmental changes associated with the project.

Section 10. Growth-Inducing Impacts of the Proposed Project: Describes the ways in which the proposed project would cause increases in employment or population that could result in new physical or environmental impacts.

Section 11. Organizations and Persons Consulted: Lists the people and organizations that were contacted during the preparation of this EIR for the Proposed Project.

Section 12. Qualifications of Persons Preparing EIR: Lists the people who prepared this EIR for the Proposed Project.

Section 13. Bibliography: A bibliography of the technical reports and other documentation used in the preparation of this EIR for the Proposed Project.

Appendices. The appendices for this document contain the following supporting documents:

- Appendix A: Notice of Preparation (NOP)
- Appendix B: NOP Comments
- Appendix C: Land Use and Zoning
- Appendix D: Proposed Ordinance Amendments
- Appendix E: Buildout Methodology
- Appendix F : Air Quality/GHG Modeling
- Appendix G: Biological Information
- Appendix H: Cultural Resources Study
- Appendix I: Noise Data
- Appendix J: Public Services Correspondence
- Appendix K: Traffic Study

1.2.2 Type and Purpose of This DEIR

This DEIR has been prepared to satisfy the requirements for a Program EIR. Although the legally required contents of a Program EIR are the same as those of a Project EIR, Program EIRs are typically more conceptual and may contain a more general or qualitative discussion of impacts, alternatives, and mitigation

1. Executive Summary

measures than a Project EIR. As provided in Section 15168 of the State CEQA Guidelines, a Program EIR may be prepared on a series of actions that may be characterized as one large project. Use of a Program EIR provides the County (as lead agency) with the opportunity to consider broad policy alternatives and program-wide mitigation measures and provides the County with greater flexibility to address project-specific and cumulative environmental impacts on a comprehensive basis.

Agencies generally prepare Program EIRs for programs or a series of related actions that are linked geographically, are logical parts of a chain of contemplated events, rules, regulations, or plans that govern the conduct of a continuing program, or are individual activities carried out under the same authority and having generally similar environmental effects that can be mitigated in similar ways.

Once a Program EIR has been prepared, subsequent activities within the program must be evaluated to determine whether an additional CEQA document needs to be prepared. However, if the Program EIR addresses the program's effects as specifically and comprehensively as possible, many subsequent activities could be found to be within the Program EIR scope and additional environmental documents may not be required (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[c]). When a Program EIR is relied on for a subsequent activity, the lead agency must incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the Program EIR into the subsequent activities (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[c][3]). If a subsequent activity would have effects that were not examined in the Program EIR, the lead agency must prepare a new Initial Study leading to a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an EIR. In this case, the Program EIR still serves a valuable purpose as the first-tier environmental analysis. The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15168[b]) encourage the use of Program EIRs, citing five advantages:

- Provide a more exhaustive consideration of impacts and alternatives than would be practical in an individual EIR;
- Focus on cumulative impacts that might be slighted in a case-by-case analysis;
- Avoid continual reconsideration of recurring policy issues;
- Consider broad policy alternatives and programmatic mitigation measures at an early stage when the agency has greater flexibility to deal with them; and,
- Reduce paperwork by encouraging the reuse of data (through tiering).

1.3 PROJECT LOCATION

The area subject to the Proposed Antelope Valley Area Plan Update (Project Area) is located in the northern part of Los Angeles County, covering approximately 1,800 square miles. The Project Area includes over two dozen unincorporated communities, and borders Ventura County to the west, Kern County to the north, San Bernardino County to the east, and the Cities of Santa Clarita, Los Angeles, Pasadena, Sierra Madre, Duarte, Azusa, and Glendora to the south. The Project Area excludes the incorporated cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, which are surrounded by the Project Area. California Interstate 5 (I-5) and State Route 14 (SR-14) connects the Project Area to the Santa Clarita Valley to the southwest. The southern portion of the Project

1. Executive Summary

Area, which contains the San Gabriel Mountains, is directly north of the San Gabriel Valley. The regional location of Los Angeles County and the Project Area is shown in Figure 3-1, *Regional Vicinity Map*.

The Project Area includes only the unincorporated areas of the Antelope Valley Region. These unincorporated areas contain large amounts of sparsely populated land and include the Angeles National Forest, part of the Los Padres National Forest, and part of the Mojave Desert. As shown in Figure 3-2, *Unincorporated Areas of Los Angeles County*, the Project Area surrounds, and therefore excludes, the cities of Lancaster and Palmdale.

1.4 PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposed project includes the following components:

- Project No. R2007-02733-(5)
- RADV 200700019 (Antelope Valley Area Plan)
- RADV 201400009 (Zoning consistency program, including new zones and other ordinance amendments)
- RZC 201400009 (Zone changes of property)
- RENV 201400201 (Environmental Impact Report)

Each of these components is discussed below.

1.4.1 Project Background

The adopted Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan (Adopted Area Plan) was adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors on December 4, 1986. It contains regional goals and policies pertaining to land use, housing, community revitalization, community design, human resources, circulation, public services and facilities, governmental services, environmental resource management, noise abatement, seismic safety, public safety, and energy conservation.

The proposed Area Plan and associated zoning consistency (Proposed Project) is a comprehensive update to the adopted 1986 Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan (Adopted Area Plan). It is the result of a highly inclusive and extensive community participation program launched in the fall of 2007. Through a series of at least 23 community meetings, residents and other stakeholders worked alongside County planners to develop a shared vision of the future, identify community issues, draft proposals for the future, and prioritize their recommendations, forming the foundation of the proposed Area Plan. Building on the foundation laid by the region's communities and from input with other stakeholders, planners partnered with other County departments to explore the recommendations, refine the proposed goals and policies, plan for program implementation, and gather support to ensure success.

1. Executive Summary

1.4.2 Proposed Area Plan

The Proposed Project is a comprehensive update of the 1986 Antelope Valley Area Plan. The project includes updated goals and policies, identification of implementing programs and associated zoning consistency and ordinances as well as a new Land Use Policy Map for the Project Area.

The Proposed Project identifies 1) Rural Preserve Areas, where residential densities would be reduced in order to protect important ecological and agricultural resources as well as minimize development in very high hazard areas; 2) Rural Town Areas, where maximum residential densities and minimum lot sizes would be established to preserve rural character; 3) Rural Town Centers, where urban commercial uses would be discouraged but rural commercial uses would be incentivized; and 4) Economic Opportunity Areas (EOAs), where plans for major infrastructure development are underway that may create the need for more detailed planning activities for these areas in the future. The Proposed Area Plan anticipates that future planning may be needed in these areas to determine any appropriate land use and zoning changes needed when these infrastructure projects are completed.

As a component of the Los Angeles County General Plan, the Area Plan would refine the countywide goals and policies in the Adopted General Plan by addressing specific issues relevant to the Project Area, such as community maintenance and appearance, preservation of rural character, open space, and agricultural lands, and provides more specific guidance on elements already found in the Adopted General Plan. All issues not covered in the Area Plan are addressed by the Adopted General Plan.

As stated above, the Proposed Area Plan would replace all elements, including the Land Use Policy Map, of the Adopted Area Plan. In addition, the adoption of the Area Plan will also amend the Adopted General Plan to reflect updated policy maps regarding the Highway Plan, hazards and resources, and Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs), etc. The Proposed Project will also include an expansion of the proposed boundaries of the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) in the Antelope Valley. These updated SEA boundaries are one of the main underpinnings of the proposed Land Use Policy Map of the Proposed Area Plan and is thus integrally incorporated into the Land Use Policy Map as indicated in Maps 2.1 through 2.3 of the Proposed Area Plan.

As stated above, the proposed Area Plan would replace all elements and portions of the Land Use Policy Map of the Adopted Area Plan.

The proposed Area Plan is organized into the following chapters:

- **Introduction.** This chapter presents the Proposed Area Plan's purpose and values, the geographic area, and the communities' vision statement.
- **Land Use Element.** This chapter discusses how the communities' vision translates into a development pattern through the concept of land use. The element contains two major components: the land use goals and policies, and the Land Use Policy Map. Proposed goals and policies articulate how the Area Plan's vision statement, Rural Preservation Strategy and incorporation of EOAs would be achieved by setting out intended land use outcomes. As a visual reflection of these goals and policies, the Land Use Policy Map identifies the types, locations and development intensities of land uses for unincorporated

1. Executive Summary

areas of the Project Area. The Land Use Policy Map is shown in Figure 3-4 (a through c), *Proposed Land Use Policy Map*.

- **Mobility Element.** This chapter describes the multimodal approach to moving around the Project Area. This element creates a framework for a balanced, multi-modal transportation system in the Project Area through goals and policies that address three topics: regional movement of services and goods, local transportation meeting the needs of residents, and the balance required to meet the demands of both. The Proposed Highway Plan is shown on Figure 3-5.
- **Economic Development Element.** This chapter discusses the ways that economic activities can be promoted in the Antelope Valley in a sustainable and ecologically sensitive manner. The chapter aims to balance economic growth with the preservation of the Project Area’s unique rural character and environmental resources.
- **Conservation and Open Space Element.** This chapter describes conservation efforts to address potential threats to natural resources. Goals and policies are provided to protect the region’s environmentally significant undisturbed natural spaces, make use of natural resources, and provide open space areas for recreation and enjoyment. The element identifies the resources and open spaces which may be developed, and gives guidance as to how sustainable land development can be conducted in the future. In addition, it identifies areas that are to be preserved from development, or are unsuitable for development due to hazards.
- **Public Safety, Services, & Facilities Element.** This chapter provides measures to ensure services are in place to maintain the safety and welfare of residents. Goals and policies outline strategies intended to fulfill the County’s mission to “enrich lives through effective and caring service.” The element identifies local hazards related to fires, geology, and floods. It also elaborates on community expectations for local services that include law enforcement, parks, schools, libraries, health facilities, and economic development.
- **Community-Specific Land Use Concepts.** This chapter highlights each established town and describes its land use form in more detail. The chapter attempts to provide expectations for how each rural community may change and grow throughout the life of the Proposed Area Plan. Land use concepts specify the desired land uses for each community and identify potentially incompatible land uses that would not be desirable. The chapter is intended to be used by residents, stakeholders, and decision-makers when considering the appropriateness of land use development projects, infrastructure improvements, and conservations efforts.
- **Plan Implementation.** This chapter describes future planning activities that will be undertaken to further implement the goals and policies described in the Proposed Area Plan. This chapter aims to provide the general framework for these activities as a guide for the County and the public in pursuing these implementing planning activities in the future.

1. Executive Summary

Policy Highlights of the Area Plan

The following discussion describes the major land use strategies in the Proposed Area Plan, which are supported by goals, policies, programs, and strategic changes to the Land Use Policy Map.

Rural Preservation Strategy

The Area Plan includes a new “Rural Preservation Strategy” that addresses issues of regional significance in a manner that builds upon the communities’ vision statement and is based on four types of environments—rural town center areas, rural town areas, rural preserve areas, and EOAs—that serve different purposes.

- **Rural town centers** are the focal points of rural communities, accessible by a range of transportation options to reduce private vehicle trips, serving the daily needs of residents, and providing local employment opportunities. These areas would be designated for commercial and/or industrial use as they are in the Adopted Area Plan, but some of these areas would also allow a mix of commercial and residential uses.
- **Rural town areas** provide a transition between rural town center areas and rural preserve areas. They are occupied by a mix of residential and light agricultural uses. The majority of new residential development should be directed to these areas, provided that such development is consistent with the existing community character and allows for light agricultural, equestrian, and animal-keeping uses where appropriate. Accordingly, allowable residential densities in these areas would generally be equal to, or greater than, allowable residential densities in the Adopted Area Plan. These areas would provide transportation linkages to rural town center areas and other nearby destination points.
- **Rural preserve areas** are the portions of the Project Area which are currently largely undeveloped and are generally not served by existing infrastructure and public facilities. Many of these areas contain Special Management Areas, such as Significant Ecological Areas, Agricultural Resource Areas, and Seismic Hazard Zones as defined in the Adopted General Plan. Therefore, residential development in these areas should be limited to single-family homes at very low densities. Accordingly, allowable residential densities in these areas would generally be far less than allowable residential densities in the adopted Area Plan. These areas are less likely to benefit from increased property tax revenues and developer fees, which may make it difficult to fund additional infrastructure, such as major roadways, water lines, and sewer lines. The Rural Preservation Strategy acknowledges this by directing additional infrastructure to rural town center areas and rural town areas, where the placement of additional infrastructure would be more cost-effective and would generally have fewer effects on the environment.

Economic Opportunity Areas (EOAs)

The Proposed Area Plan also identifies three EOAs. These are areas where plans for major infrastructure projects are underway that would create conditions for development vastly different than currently existing on the ground. Because of ongoing plans by Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to build the High Desert Corridor Project in the eastern Antelope Valley, and the Northwest 138 Corridor Improvement Project in the western Antelope Valley, the Area Plan identifies three EOAs:

1. Executive Summary

- **East EOA.** This area encompasses the communities of Lake Los Angeles, Sun Village, Littlerock, Pearblossom, Llano and Crystalaire.
- **Central EOA.** This area is located along Avenue D, just north of Fox Field Airport and west of the CA-14 Freeway.
- **West EOA.** This area is located along Highway 138 east and west of the California Aqueduct and including portions of Neenach.

The Proposed Area Plan includes an implementation program for future community plans if warranted, to further analyze the effects of planned infrastructure projects in these areas, and recommend land use and zoning changes and revised policies as necessary. Prior to any master-planned development approval in the West EOA, a specific plan, community plan, or other similar planning document is required to ensure orderly development.

Special Management Areas

The county's existing Special Management Areas require additional development regulations that are necessary to prevent the loss of life and property, and to protect the natural environment and important resources. Special Management Areas include but are not limited to Agricultural Resource Areas, Airport Influence Areas, Seismic Hazard Zones, Flood Hazard Zones, Significant Ecological Areas, Hillside Management Areas, and Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones. The Proposed Project minimizes risks to hazards and limits development in Special Management Areas through refined goals, policies, and programs from the Adopted General Plan.

Agricultural Resource Areas (ARAs) are areas where the Proposed Project promotes the preservation of agricultural land. These areas are protected by policies to prevent the conversion of farmland to incompatible uses.

Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) include undisturbed or lightly disturbed habitat supporting valuable and threatened species, linkages and corridors to promote species movement, and are sized to support sustainable populations of its component species. The objective of the SEA Program is to preserve the genetic and physical diversity of the County by designing biological resource areas capable of sustaining themselves into the future. However SEAs are not wilderness preserves. Much of the land in SEAs is privately held, used for public recreation or abutting developed areas. Thus the SEA Program is intended to ensure that privately held lands within the SEAs retain the right of reasonable use, while avoiding activities and development projects that are incompatible with the long term survival of the SEAs. As part of the Countywide General Plan Update, an update to the existing Significant Ecological Areas Ordinance has been proposed. Although the SEA Ordinance update is not part of this Proposed Project, the updated SEA boundaries are part of the Proposed Project and the Proposed Land Use Policy Maps are based on the updated boundaries. The updated SEA boundaries for the Project Area are shown on Figure 3-6.

1. Executive Summary

Hillside Management Areas (HMAs) are areas with a natural slope gradient of 25 percent or steeper. The adopted provisions regulating HMAs ensure that development preserves the physical character and scenic value in HMAs.

Zoning Consistency

Proposed Zoning Map Amendments

In order to maintain consistency between the updated Area Plan Land Use Policy Map and the Zoning Map, rezoning is necessary where the proposed land use designation would no longer be consistent with Area Plan Land Use Policy Map. The Area Plan Land Use Policy Map establishes the long-range vision for general intended uses. In addition, the zoning consistency program also includes amendments to the Zoning Code, Title 22 (Planning and Zoning) of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Code herein) and Zoning Map implement that vision by providing details on specific allowable uses. The Proposed Zoning is shown in Figure 3-7 (a through c), *Proposed Zoning*. A complete description of the proposed land use and zoning changes is included in Appendix C of this DEIR.

Proposed Amendments to the Zoning Code

In order to implement goals and policies included in the Proposed Area Plan and to ensure zoning consistency, revisions to the Zoning Code will be part of the Proposed Project. These include the creation of the following two new zones, which are included in their entirety in Appendix D of this DEIR:

- **C-RU Rural Commercial Zone:** Zone C-RU provides detailed uses, development standards, and procedures for low-intensity commercial uses that are compatible with rural, agricultural, and low-density residential uses. The intent of the zone is to serve the diverse economic needs of rural communities, while preserving their unique characters and identities.
- **MXD-RU Mixed Use Rural Zone:** Zone MXD-RU provides detailed uses, development standards, and procedures for a limited mix of commercial uses and very low-density multifamily residential uses on the same lot within rural town centers.

Additional amendments to Title 22 of the County Code would do the following:

- Update applicability criteria for the existing provisions regulating SEAs.
- Add “museums” and “zip-lines” to the list of uses allowed in the Commercial-Recreation (C-R) Zone.

1.4.3 Physical Development under the Proposed Project

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(d), this DEIR determines whether there are direct physical changes and reasonably foreseeable indirect physical changes in the environment that would be caused by the Proposed Project. Specifically, this DEIR focuses on impacts from changes to land use associated with buildout of the proposed land use maps and impacts from overall population and employment growth in the Project Area. The ultimate development of unincorporated areas is not tied to a specific timeline.

1. Executive Summary

Buildout projections for the Proposed Project are shown in Table 1-1, *Buildout Projections for the Proposed Project*. These buildout projections are used throughout this DEIR to estimate the magnitude of development that would likely occur within the Project Area upon buildout of the Proposed Project. The total acreage for each land use designation is used to estimate the number of dwelling units, residents, square feet of nonresidential uses, and jobs that would be generated. These projections are used extensively in the analysis of potential project impacts such as increases in air quality, noise, and traffic.

It is impossible to perfectly predict the exact amount, timeline, or distribution of development that would occur under the Proposed Project. However, the estimates in Table 1-1 allow for analysis of potential impacts on a programmatic level.

Table 1-1 Buildout Projections for the Proposed Project

Proposed Land Use	Acres	Dwelling Units	Population	Nonresidential Floor Area (sq. ft.)	Employment
CR – Rural Commercial	1,793	-	-	19,508,183	38,376
MU-R – Rural Commercial/Mixed Use	693	1,386	5,337	3,773,743	7,385
H2 – Residential 2	4,562	7,299	28,101	-	300
H5 – Residential 5	6,687	26,748	102,978	-	-
H9 – Residential 9	453	3,264	11,752	-	-
H18 – Residential 18	121	1,737	6,253	-	-
H30 – Residential 30	84	2,013	5,615	-	-
IH – Heavy Industrial	1,980	-	-	16,060,113	14,575
IL – Light Industrial	4,173	-	-	90,884,331	69,590
OS-BLM – Bureau of Land Management	9,002	-	-	-	-
OS-C – Conservation	19,670	-	-	-	-
ML – Military Land	41,779	-	-	-	-
OS-NF – Open Space National Forest	499,734	-	-	-	50
OS-PR – Parks and Recreation	19,315	-	-	-	346
W – Water	11,038	-	-	-	-
P – Public and Semi-Public	19,870	-	-	-	3,175
RL1 – Rural Land 1	10,242	10,242	39,431	-	2
RL2 – Rural Land 2	30,833	15,417	59,354	-	400
RL5 – Rural Land 5	36,329	7,266	27,973	-	-
RL10 – Rural Land 10	204,000	20,400	78,540	-	100
RL20 – Rural Land 20	208,187	10,409	40,076	-	50
Total	1,130,544	106,180	405,410	130,226,370	134,351
Existing		24,739	93,490	12,525,880	31,838
Increase Over Existing		81,441	311,920	117,700,490	102,513

Note: Historically, jurisdiction-wide build-out levels do not achieve the maximum allowable density/intensity on every parcel and are, on average, lower than allowed by the proposed Area Plan. Accordingly, the build-out projections in this Area Plan do not assume build-out at the maximum density or intensity and instead are adjusted downward to account for variations in build-out intensity.

As shown in Table 1-1, buildout of the Proposed Project would result in approximately 81,441 additional housing units in the Project Area compared to existing conditions. These new units would generate approximately 311,920 additional residents. Buildout of the Proposed Project would also result in a nine-fold

1. Executive Summary

increase in total nonresidential (commercial and industrial) space. New employment-generating land uses would result in an increase of approximately 102,513 more jobs than under existing conditions.

1.5 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

As described in Section 7 of this DEIR, three alternatives were considered but rejected during the project scoping/planning process:

- Project Planning Alternatives
- No Growth/No Development Alternative

In addition, three project alternatives were identified and analyzed in detail for relative impacts as compared to the Proposed Project:

- No-Project/Adopted Area Plan Alternative
- Reduced Intensity Alternative
- Alternative Land Use Policy Map

The following presents a summary of each of the alternatives analyzed in the EIR. These alternatives were developed to avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts of the Proposed Project. Please refer to Section 7 of this EIR for a complete discussion of how the alternatives were selected and the relative impacts associated with each alternative.

1.5.1 No Project/Adopted Area Plan Alternative

This alternative, which is required by CEQA, assumes that the Adopted Area Plan and implementing zoning would remain unchanged. The Adopted Area Plan, originally adopted on December 4, 1986, would remain in effect, and no update to the Adopted Area Plan goals and policies would occur. This alternative would also maintain the existing SEA boundaries. Other key components of the Proposed Project, including the Rural Preservation Strategy and establishment of the Rural Town Center, Rural Town Areas, and Rural Preserve Areas, as well as Economic Opportunity Areas (EOAs), would also not occur under this alternative. Under the No Project/Adopted Area Plan Alternative, a total of 278,158 dwelling units (additional 253,419 units from existing), a total population of 1,070,571 (additional 977,081 persons from existing), and a total of 51,219 employees (additional 19,381 employees from existing) would occur at buildout.

1.5.2 Reduced Intensity Alternative

This alternative would reduce the overall additional development intensity by 30 percent within the Project Area as compared to the Proposed Project. Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, a comprehensive update to the Adopted Area Plan goals and policies would occur, similar to the Proposed Project. Updates to the existing SEA boundaries based on the latest biological information and GIS mapping data would also occur. Other key components of the Proposed Project, including the Rural Preservation Strategy and establishment of the Rural Town Center, Rural Town Areas, Rural Preserve Areas, and EOAs would occur under this alternative. Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, a total of 81,748 dwelling units (57,009 more than

1. Executive Summary

existing), a total population of 311,834 (218,344 more than existing), and a total of 103,597 employees (71,759 more than existing) would occur at buildout.

1.5.3 Alternative Land Use Policy Map

This Alternative proposes an alternative land use policy map for the Proposed Project. Under the Alternative Land Use Policy Map, a comprehensive update to the Adopted Area Plan goals and policies would occur, similar to the Proposed Project. Updates to the existing SEA boundaries based on the latest biological information and GIS mapping data would also occur. Other key components of the Proposed Project, including the Rural Preservation Strategy and establishment of the Rural Town Center, Rural Town Areas, Rural Preserve Areas, and EOAs would also occur under this alternative. Under the Alternative Land Use Policy Map, a total of 67,463 dwelling units (42,724 more than existing), a total population of 248,323 (154,833 more than existing), and a total of 46,225 employees (14,387 more than existing) would occur at buildout.

1.6 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR contain issues to be resolved including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. With regard to the proposed project, the major issues to be resolved include decisions by the lead agency as to the following:

1. Whether this DEIR adequately describes the environmental impacts of the project.
2. Whether the benefits of the project override those environmental impacts which cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to a level of insignificance.
3. Whether the proposed land use changes are compatible with the character of the existing area.
4. Whether the identified goals, policies, or mitigation measures should be adopted or modified.
5. Whether there are other mitigation measures that should be applied to the project besides the Mitigation Measures identified in the DEIR.
6. Whether there are any alternatives to the project that would substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the proposed project and achieve most of the basic project objectives.

1.7 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The County determined that an EIR would be required for this project and issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on June 12, 2014, to the State Clearinghouse, responsible agencies, and interested parties. The 30-day public review period ran from June 12, 2014 through July 11, 2014. The NOP and NOP comments are included as Appendix A.

Pursuant to the California Public Resources Code Section 21803.9, the County conducted two public scoping meetings on June 26, 2014 and July 7, 2014. The purpose of these meetings was to provide a public forum for information dissemination and dialogue regarding the components of the Proposed Project, the overall

1. Executive Summary

process, and the DEIR. The scoping meetings were attended by various agency representatives, stakeholders, and government officials. Issues and questions raised at the scoping meetings include:

- Employment Opportunity Area (EOA) Boundaries
- Centennial Specific Plan
- Programmatic versus Project EIRs
- Water supply issues
- Ability to make further land use changes
- Projected buildout estimates for proposed land uses
- How do future community plans relate to the Proposed Area Plan

NOP comments are summarized below in Table 1-2.

Table 1-2 Summary of NOP Comments

Commenting Agency/Person	Comment Type	Comment Summary	Issue Addressed In:
Agencies			
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 7	Transportation, Land Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommends seeking methods for funding for improvements to Caltrans facilities • Requests inclusion of Caltrans in environmental review of development projects • Significance thresholds for impacts to State highways • Suggestions regarding mitigation approaches • Concerned about consistency between Circulation and Land Use elements¹ • Requests analysis of impacts on jobs-housing balance 	Sections 5.16, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> , 5.10, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> , and 5.13, <i>Population and Housing</i> .
Ventura County Watershed Protection District	Hydrology and Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommends collaboration between Los Angeles and Ventura counties regarding managing flood hazards along Santa Clara River. 	Section 5.9, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> .
Los Angeles World Airports	Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommends zoning consistent with heavy-industrial aviation uses • Requests collaboration with County in developing proposed SEA ordinance • Urges that utility-scale ground-mounted renewable energy facilities be permitted in A-1 zone. 	Section 5.10, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> .
California Department of Fish and Wildlife		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis and mitigation of impacts to sensitive biological resources, including ecosystems unique to Los Angeles County. • Recommends EIR address best management practices for conservation of biological resources respecting solar and wind energy 	Section 5.10, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> .

¹ Caltrans also commented about consistency between the circulation, land use, and housing elements. The Area Plan does not contain a housing element; a separate Housing Element to the County General Plan was approved by the County Board of Supervisors on February 4, 2014.

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-2 Summary of NOP Comments

Commenting Agency/Person	Comment Type	Comment Summary	Issue Addressed In:
		<p>projects set forth on the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan website</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations for tiering of CEQA documentation for development projects pursuant to the Area Plan. • Presents recommendations regarding analysis in the EIR, including: project description, alternatives, existing conditions, impact analysis (especially to streambeds, riparian habitat, and CESA-listed species); and mitigation approaches. 	
Organizations			
Greater Antelope Valley Association of Realtors		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests that only approved Significant Ecological Areas (SEA) Ordinance be analyzed and that proposed SEA Ordinance be analyzed in <i>Alternatives</i>. • Regarding Rural Preservation Strategy, requests that densities in approved Community Standards Districts be analyzed as an alternative. • Requests that exclude agricultural lands from proposed Rural Preserve designation • Requests analysis of impacts of Economic Opportunity Areas as proposed (without further actions such as Community Plans), as an alternative • Recommends analysis of economic impacts of downzoning in proposed Rural Preserve designations, and of proposed land use map generally • Requests analysis of schools impacts • Requests detailed explanation of how the land use plan was developed from the Hazards, Environmental and Resource Constraints (ECM) Model 	Sections 5.10, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> , 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i> , 5.14, <i>Public Services</i> , and Chapter 7, <i>Alternatives</i> .
Southern California Association of Governments	Land Use, Transportation, Population and Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests subsequent CEQA documentation for this project • Recommendations on analyzing consistency with 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) goals • States Draft EIR should reflect SCAG Adopted 2012 Growth Forecast • Recommends review of 2012 RTP/SCS FEIR mitigation measures 	Sections 5.10, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> , 5.13, <i>Population and Housing</i> , and 5.16, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> .
Ana Verde Hills Town Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests that only approved Significant Ecological Areas (SEA) Ordinance be analyzed; and that proposed SEA Ordinance be analyzed in <i>Alternatives</i>. • Requests analysis of impacts of Economic Opportunity Areas as proposed (without further 	Chapter 7, <i>Alternatives</i> .

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-2 Summary of NOP Comments

Commenting Agency/Person	Comment Type	Comment Summary	Issue Addressed In:
		actions such as Community Plans), as an alternative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests analysis of impacts of changes to land use designations compared to current designations approved by Community Standards Districts • Opposes development boundaries surrounding rural town centers • Recommends analysis of economic impacts of downzoning in proposed Rural Preserve designations, and of proposed land use map generally • Requests analysis of schools impacts 	
Tricounty Watchdogs	Aesthetics; Air Quality; Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Utilities and Service Systems; Population and Housing; Public Services; Transportation and Traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests analysis of impacts to aesthetics along major highways • Requests consideration of buffer zones along goods movement corridors and next to agricultural areas for protection of the public from emissions • Requests analysis of impacts on California condors and on wildlife corridors. • Requests analysis of impacts to Native American archaeological resources. • Requests analysis of impacts of traffic from Centennial project on GHG emissions. • Requests consideration of a buffer zone around heavy industrial land uses. • Requests analysis of impacts on water supplies, especially of Tejon Ranch Co. projects. • Requests analysis of population and employment impacts of proposed Centennial project. • Requests analysis of impacts to public services • Requests analysis of transportation impacts • Requests analysis of utilities and service systems regarding earthquake hazards • Requests a separate EIR for proposed Centennial project 	Sections 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> , 5.5, <i>Cultural Resources</i> , 5.6, <i>Geology and Soils</i> , 5.9, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> 5.10, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> , 5.14, <i>Public Services</i> , 5.16, <i>Transportation/Traffic</i> , and 5.17, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i> .
Residents and Businesses			
Vance Pomeroy Director, Association of Rural Town Councils	Land Use; Biological Resources; Air Quality; Public Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests analysis of impacts of density and exclusion contrasted with dispersal of land uses • Requests detailed explanation of how the land use plan was developed from the Hazards, Environmental and Resource Constraints (ECM) Model • Opposes development boundaries surrounding rural town centers • Requests analysis of impacts of changes to land use designations compared to current 	Sections 5.10, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> , 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i> , 5.14, <i>Public Services</i> , and Chapter 7, <i>Alternatives</i> .

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-2 Summary of NOP Comments

Commenting Agency/Person	Comment Type	Comment Summary	Issue Addressed In:
		<p>designations approved by Community Standards Districts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests that only approved Significant Ecological Areas (SEA) Ordinance be analyzed; and that proposed SEA Ordinance be analyzed in <i>Alternatives</i>. • Requests analysis of impacts of Economic Opportunity Areas as proposed (without further actions such as Community Plans), as an alternative • Requests analysis of health risks from dust from large cleared lots • Requests analysis of schools impacts 	
Billet, Ray F.	Land Use/Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned with the changed land use acreage without prior hearing. 	Not applicable.
Blalock, John	Hydrology/Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned with the broadening of most of the SEA areas and the AV Plan interference with water conservation. • Suggests the alternative to leave the SEAs the same as in 1986. • Requests that the Plan support water conservation programs/water banking policies for the SEA areas. 	Section 5.9, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> .
Fuentes, Judith	Agricultural/Forest Resources; Land Use/Planning; Public Services; Transportation/Traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests that agricultural opportunity areas be included in the DEIR. • Concerned that Economic Opportunity Areas should not be in any rural area past W. 70th St. • Concerned about the similar appearances of rural town centers. • Suggests that solar generating facilities be in industrial areas. • Suggests that no commercial area should be added to Fox Field area. • Concerned about safety of freeways. 	Sections 5.2, <i>Agriculture and Forestry Resources</i> , 5.14, <i>Public Services</i> , and 5.16, <i>Transportation/Traffic</i>
Justice, Mary	Land Use/Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests that 30 days is too short a time period to prepare an EIR without scientific data regarding dwelling units. • Requests the scientific proof be produced for each area of the AVAP. • Requests that her 80 acres be placed in the MU-R land use/zone. 	Not applicable.
McElroy, Forrest (Ana Verde Hills Town Council)	Public Services; Transportation/Traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests the EIR only analyze adopted ordinances. • Requests that Economic Opportunity Areas be addressed directly in the EIR. • Requests that the EIR include current and proposed transit projects. • Requests that the EIR address impacts on the school districts in the valley. 	Sections 5.14, <i>Public Services</i> , and 5.16, <i>Transportation/Traffic</i> .

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-2 Summary of NOP Comments

Commenting Agency/Person	Comment Type	Comment Summary	Issue Addressed In:
Pascual, Irwin	Land Use/Planning; Public Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggests that plans be made to potentially create a State college in Antelope Valley. 	Section 5.14, <i>Public Services</i> .
Pomeroy, Vance	Land Use/Planning; Population/Housing; Public Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggests that the key focus of the EIR be balance. Requests that the following suggestions be incorporated into the EIR: 1) address how focus on population and activity concentration as an exclusive land use planning tool impacts the environment; 2) 'how', 'why', 'with what data' the links between the ECM and the AVAP land use designations were arrived at; 3) alternative with Community Standards Districts zoning; 4) address land use and zoning changes; include an analysis of approved SEA ordinance only as included in Project Alternatives; 5) accurately address impacts associated with allotted residential units and projected commercial acreage that will bring jobs/housing and 6) potential impacts on school districts. 	Section 5.14, <i>Public Services</i> .
Stout, Virginia (Antelope Acres Town Council)	Land Use/Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests the following changes in the DEIR: 1) removal of EOA designation for areas between Ave B (north), Ave J (south); 60th St W (east), and 110th St (west); 2) delete rural commercial and mixed use zones from above named area, except in Town Center; 3) remove Energy Ordinance areas from within borders of Antelope Acres; 4) add 90th St W from Ave J to Ave A, Ave I to Lancaster Rd to Hwy 138/Ave D, Ave D/Hwy 138 from 60th St W to 5 freeway to designation of proposed scenic highways and 5) change terms "degraded" and "disturbed farmland" to "second growth desert". Questions why RL 40 was changed to RL 20. Questions if temporary solar industrial jobs counted in jobs build out numbers. 	Not applicable.

1.8 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Table 1-3 summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis contained in this EIR. Impacts are identified as significant or less than significant and for all significant impacts mitigation measures are identified. The level of significance after imposition of the mitigation measures is also presented.

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.1 AESTHETICS			
Impact 5.1-1: Implementation of the Proposed Project would alter existing views of scenic vistas.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.1-2: Implementation of the Proposed Project would not substantially alter scenic resources within a state scenic highway.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.1-3: Implementation of the Proposed Project would alter the existing visual character of portions of the Project Area and its surroundings.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.1-4: Implementation of the Proposed Project would generate additional sources of light and glare that could adversely affect day and nighttime views in the Project Area.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
5.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES			
Impact 5.2-1: Buildout of the Proposed Project would convert California agency-designated farmland to non-agricultural uses.	Potentially Significant	No mitigation measures are available that would reduce impacts of conversion of mapped important farmland to less than significant.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact 5.2-2: The Proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.2-3: The Proposed Project would not conflict with zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.2-4: The Proposed Project will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to nonforest use.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 5.2-5: Buildout of the Proposed Project would involve other changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to nonforest use.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are available that would reduce impacts related to conversion of farmland and/or forest land to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>
<p>5.3 AIR QUALITY</p>			
<p>Impact 5.3-1: The Proposed Project would generate less growth than the Adopted Area Plan; however, it would not be consistent with the SCAQMD's and AVAQMD's air quality management plans because buildout of the Proposed Project would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB and MDAB.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are available that would reduce impacts associated with inconsistency with the air quality management plans due to the magnitude of growth and associated emissions that would be generated by the buildout of the Project Area in accordance with the Proposed Project.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>
<p>Impact 5.3-2: Construction activities associated with the Antelope Valley Area Plan would generate a substantial increase in short-term criteria air pollutant emissions that exceed the SCAQMD and AVAQMD significance thresholds and would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB and Antelope Valley portion of the MDAB.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>AQ-1 If, during subsequent project-level environmental review, construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the applicable air quality management district (AQMD) adopted thresholds of significance, applicants for new development projects shall be required to comply with mitigation measures as identified in the CEQA document prepared for the individual development project to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities. Mitigation measures that may be identified during the environmental review include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction contractors of development projects shall use construction equipment rated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency as having Tier 3 (model year 2006 or newer) or Tier 4 (model year 2008 or newer) emission limits, applicable for engines between 50 and 750 horsepower. Use of Tier 3 construction equipment shall be included as a note on grading plans submitted to the County. • Grading plans shall include a note that construction contractors shall ensure construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturer's standards. • Grading plans shall include a note that, if feasible, construction contractors shall consider use of off-road equipment that is tire-based rather than track-based, which creates more ground disturbance. • Grading plans shall include a note that construction contractors shall limit 	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more than five consecutive minutes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grading plans shall include a note that construction contractors shall water all active construction areas at least three times daily, or as often as needed to control dust emissions. Watering should be sufficient to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency may be necessary whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible. • Grading plans shall include a note that construction contractors shall cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard (i.e., the minimum required space between the top of the load and the top of the trailer). • Grading plans shall include a note that construction contractors shall pave, apply water three times daily or as often as necessary to control dust, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites. • Grading plans shall include a note that construction contractors shall sweep daily (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible), or as often as needed, all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at the construction site to control dust. • Grading plans shall include a note that construction contractors shall sweep public streets daily (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) in the vicinity of the project site, or as often as needed, to keep streets free of visible soil material. • Grading plans shall include a note that construction contractors shall hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (i.e., areas not being actively disturbed for 10 or more days). • Grading plans shall include a note that construction contractors shall enclose, cover, water three times daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.). • Grading plans shall include a note that construction contractors shall minimize ground disturbance (e.g., vegetation removal and mowing), to the extent feasible. 	

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 5.3-3: Long-term operation of the Proposed Project would generate a substantial increase in criteria air pollutant emissions that exceed the threshold criteria and would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB and Antelope Valley portion of the MDAB.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>Goals and policies are included in the Proposed Project that would reduce air pollutant emissions. However, due to the magnitude of emissions generated by the buildout of residential, office, commercial, industrial, and warehousing land uses in the Project Area, no mitigation measures are available that would reduce impacts below SCAQMD's or AVAQMD's thresholds.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>
<p>Impact 5.3-4: Buildout of the Proposed Project could result in new source sources of criteria air pollutant emissions and/or toxic air contaminants proximate to existing or planned sensitive receptors.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>AQ-2 New industrial or warehousing land uses that: 1) have the potential to generate 40 or more diesel trucks per day and 2) are located within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g. residential, schools, hospitals, nursing homes), as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the County prior to future discretionary project approval. When required, the HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and the applicable air quality management district. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds ten in one million (10E 06), particulate matter concentrations would exceed 2.5 µg/m3, or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that best available control technologies for toxics (T BACTs) that are capable of reducing potential cancer and noncancer risks to an acceptable level, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. T BACTs may include, but are not limited to, restricting idling onsite or electrifying warehousing docks to reduce diesel particulate matter, or requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles. T BACTs identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the proposed project.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>
<p>Impact 5.3-5: Placement of new sensitive receptors near major sources of toxic air contaminants in the Project Area could expose people to substantial pollutant concentrations.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>AQ-3 Applicants for sensitive land uses in proximity to the following facilities and within the following distances as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the source/edge of the nearest travel lane, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the County prior to future discretionary project approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial facilities within 1000 feet • Distribution centers (40 or more trucks per day) within 1,000 feet • Major transportation projects (50,000 or more vehicles per day) within 1,000 feet 	<p>Less Than Significant</p>

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dry cleaners using perchloroethylene within 500 feet • Gasoline dispensing facilities within 300 feet <p>When required, the HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the applicable Air Quality Management District. The latest OEHHA guidelines shall be used for the analysis, including age sensitivity factors, breathing rates, and body weights appropriate for children age 0 to 6 years. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds ten in one million (10E 06) or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and non-cancer risks to an acceptable level (i.e., below ten in one million or a hazard index of 1.0), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Measures to reduce risk may include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air intakes located away from high volume roadways and/or truck loading zones, unless it can be demonstrated to the County Department of Regional Planning that there are operational limitations. • Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems of the buildings provided with appropriately sized maximum efficiency rating value (MERV) filters. <p>Mitigation measures identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the proposed project. The air intake design and MERV filter requirements shall be noted and/or reflected on all building plans submitted to the County.</p>	
<p>Impact 5.3-6: Industrial land uses associated with the Proposed Project could create objectionable odors.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>AQ-4 If it is determined during project-level environmental review that a project has the potential to emit nuisance odors beyond the property line, an odor management plan may be required, subject to County's regulations. Facilities that have the potential to generate nuisance odors include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wastewater treatment plants • Composting, greenwaste, or recycling facilities • Fiberglass manufacturing facilities 	<p>Less Than Significant</p>

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Painting/coating operations • Large-capacity coffee roasters • Food-processing facilities <p>If an odor management plan is determined to be required through CEQA review, the County shall require the project applicant to submit the plan prior to approval to ensure compliance with the applicable Air Quality Management District's Rule 402, for nuisance odors. If applicable, the Odor Management Plan shall identify the Best Available Control Technologies for Toxics (T BACTs) that will be utilized to reduce potential odors to acceptable levels, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. T BACTs may include, but are not limited to, scrubbers (e.g., air pollution control devices) at the industrial facility. T BACTs identified in the odor management plan shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site plan.</p>	
5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
<p>Impact 5.4-1: Development of the Proposed Project would impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>BIO-1 Biological resources shall be analyzed on a project-specific level by a qualified biological consultant. A general survey shall be conducted to characterize the project site, and focused surveys should be conducted as necessary to determine the presence/absence of special-status species (e.g., focused sensitive plant or wildlife surveys). For proposed projects within SEAs, biological resources assessment report shall be prepared to characterize the biological resources on-site, analyze project-specific impacts to biological resources, and propose appropriate mitigation measures to offset those impacts. The report shall include site location, literature sources, methodology, timing of surveys, vegetation map, site photographs, and descriptions of biological resources on-site (e.g., observed and detected species as well as an analysis of those species with potential to occur onsite).</p> <p>BIO-2 If there is potential for direct impacts to special-status species with implementation of construction activities, the project-specific biological assessment (as mentioned in Mitigation Measure BIO-1) shall include mitigation measures requiring pre-construction surveys for special-status species and/or construction monitoring to ensure avoidance, relocation, or safe escape of special-status species from the construction activities, as appropriate. If special-status species are found to be nesting, brooding, denning, etc., on-site during the pre-</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		construction survey or monitoring, construction activity shall be halted until offspring are weaned, fledged, etc. and are able to escape the site or be safely relocated to appropriate offsite habitat areas. Relocations into areas of appropriate restored habitat would have the best chance of replacing/incrementing populations that are lost due to habitat converted to development. Relocation to restored habitat areas should be the preferred goal of this measure. A qualified biologist shall be on site to conduct surveys, to perform or oversee implementation of protective measures, and to determine when construction activity may resume.	
Impact 5.4-2: Development of the Proposed Project would result in the loss of riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS.	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 apply.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact 5.4-3: The Proposed Project would impact federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.	Potentially Significant	Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 apply.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.4-4: The Proposed Project would affect wildlife movement of 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.	Potentially Significant	BIO-3 Currently, development proposed within SEAs requires a conditional use permit, which provides additional protection to wildlife movement corridors and other sensitive biological resources. Proposed projects are requested to be designed so that wildlife movement corridors are left in an undisturbed and natural state. In practice, this protection typically involves adopting appropriate buffers around sensitive resources and setting aside undisturbed areas. However, no feasible mitigation measures are available that would reduce impacts to wildlife movement entirely.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact 5.4-5: The Proposed Project would require compliance with adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES			
<p>Impact 5.5-1: Development pursuant to the Proposed Project could impact historic resources.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>CUL-1 If, during any subsequent project-level review and prior to development, activities that would demolish or otherwise physically alter buildings, structures, or features of an officially listed historic or cultural resource; or historic buildings, structures, or features officially determined eligible for designation as a historic or cultural resource, a cultural resource professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Architectural History shall be retained by the project applicant, at the discretion of the County, to determine if the project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. The results of the investigation shall be documented in a technical report or memorandum that identifies and evaluates any historical resources within the improvements area and includes recommendations and methods for eliminating or reducing impacts on historical resources. Methods may include, but are not limited to, written and photographic recordation of the resource in accordance with the level of Historic American Building Survey (HABS) documentation that is appropriate to the significance (local, state, national) of the resource.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>
<p>Impact 5.5-2: Buildout of the Proposed Project could destroy archaeological or paleontological resources or a unique geologic feature.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>CUL-2 Prior to the issuance of any grading permit associated with a discretionary project, applicants shall provide written evidence to the County of Los Angeles that a County-approved archaeologist has been retained to observe grading activities greater than three feet in depth and to salvage and curate archaeological resources as necessary. The archaeologist shall be present at the pre-grade conference, shall establish procedures for archaeological resource surveillance, and shall establish, in cooperation with the applicant, procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit the sampling, identification, and evaluation of the artifacts as appropriate.</p> <p>The archaeologist shall be present at the pre-grade conference, shall establish procedures for archaeologist resource surveillance and monitoring, and shall establish, in cooperation with the applicant, procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit the sampling, identification, and evaluation of the fossils as appropriate and obtain a commitment from an American Association of Museums accredited repository for the storage of any recovered significant archaeological remains.</p> <p>If the archaeological resources are found to be significant, the archaeologist shall determine appropriate actions, in cooperation with the project applicant and the County,</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>for exploration and/or salvage. Any recovered significant archaeological resources shall be permanently transferred to an appropriate repository, subject to the fees and conditions of acceptance as established by the repository in their repository agreement. Prior to the release of the grading bond, the applicant shall submit a report prepared by the archaeologist that identifies the period of inspection, an analysis of any artifacts found and the present repository of the artifacts. Applicant shall prepare excavated material to the point of identification.</p> <p>Applicant shall offer excavated finds for curatorial purposes to the County of Los Angeles, or its designee, on a first refusal basis, if required by mitigation measures. These actions, as well as final mitigation and disposition of the resources shall be subject to the approval of the County.</p> <p>CULT-3 Prior to the issuance of any grading permit associated with a discretionary project, applicants shall provide written evidence to the County of Los Angeles that a County-approved paleontologist has been retained to observe grading activities greater than three feet in depth and to salvage and curate paleontological resources as necessary. The paleontologist shall be present at the pre-grade conference, shall establish procedures for paleontologist resource surveillance, and shall establish, in cooperation with the applicant, procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit the sampling, identification, and evaluation of the artifacts as appropriate.</p> <p>The paleontologist shall be present at the pre-grade conference, shall establish procedures for paleontologist resource surveillance and monitoring, and shall establish, in cooperation with the applicant, procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit the sampling, identification, and evaluation of the fossils as appropriate and obtain a commitment from an American Association of Museums accredited repository for the storage of any recovered significant paleontological remains.</p> <p>If the paleontological resources are found to be significant, the paleontologist shall determine appropriate actions, in cooperation with the project applicant and the County, for exploration and/or salvage. Any recovered significant paleontological resources shall be permanently transferred to an appropriate repository, subject to the fees and conditions of acceptance as established by the repository in their repository agreement.</p>	

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Prior to the release of the grading bond, the applicant shall obtain approval of the paleontologist's report, from the County. The report shall include the period of inspection, an analysis of any fossils found and the present repository of the fossils. Applicant shall prepare excavated material to the point of identification.</p> <p>Applicant shall offer excavated finds for curatorial purposes to the County of Los Angeles, or its designee, on a first refusal basis, if required by mitigation measures. These actions, as well as final mitigation and disposition of the resources shall be subject to the approval of the County.</p>	
Impact 5.5-3: Grading activities pursuant to buildout of the Proposed Project could potentially disturb human remains.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
5.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS			
Impact 5.6-1: Project Area residents, occupants, or structures could potentially be exposed to seismic-related hazards.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.6-2: Plan implementation would result in substantial soil erosion, the loss of topsoil, or development atop unstable geologic units or soils, or expansive soils.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.6-3: Soil conditions would adequately support proposed septic tanks.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
5.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS			
Impact 5.7-1: Buildout of the Proposed Project would result in a substantial increase in GHG emissions compared to existing conditions and would also not meet the long-term GHG reduction goal under Executive Order S-03-05.	Potentially Significant	<p>GHG-1 The County of Los Angeles shall include the following implementation actions, consistent with the CCAP measures drafted in the Final Unincorporated Los Angeles County Community Climate Action Plan 2020, in the Antelope Valley Area Plan Implementation Plan (Chapter 8) to ensure progress toward meeting the long-term GHG reduction goals of Executive Order S 03 05:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require new residential and now residential buildings within the Antelope Valley Area Plan to achieve the Tier 1 energy standards within California Green Building 	Significant and Unavoidable

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Standards Code (Title 24, Part 11). The voluntary Tier 1 CALGreen requires a 15 percent increase in energy efficiency compared to the Building and Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6). Architectural building plans shall be submitted to the County that identify features that achieve the Tier 1 energy standards (corresponding CCAP Measure BE-1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require that new residential and non-residential building be constructed to accommodate roof-top solar installation. Architectural building plans shall be submitted to the County shall identify this requirement (corresponding CCAP Measure BE-3). • Prior to issuance of building permits for new construction of non-residential development of 100,000 building square feet or more within the Antelope Valley Area Plan, the applicant shall identify bicycle end-trip facilities, including bike parking and lockers. The location of the bicycle storage shall be specified on site plans and verified by Department of Regional Planning prior to building permit issuance (corresponding CCAP Measure LUT-1). • Require installation of Level 2 (240 volt) electric vehicle (EV) charging facilities at County-owned public venues (e.g., hospitals, beaches, stand-alone parking facilities, cultural institutions, and other facilities) within the Antelope Valley Area Plan and ensure that at least one-third of these charging stations will be available for visitor use (corresponding CCAP Measure LUT-8). <p>GHG-2 The County of Los Angeles shall include the following additional implementation actions in the Antelope Valley Area Plan Implementation Plan (Chapter 8) to ensure progress toward meeting the long-term GHG reduction goals of Executive Order S 03 05:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to issuance of building permits for new construction of residential development, the property owner/developer shall indicate on plans that garage and/or car port parking are electrically wired to accommodate a Level 2 (240 volt) EV charging. The location of the electrical outlets shall be specified on building plans, and proper installation shall be verified by Department of Public Works prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. • Prior to issuance of building permits for new construction of non-residential development of 100,000 building square feet or more within the Antelope Valley 	

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Area Plan, the applicant shall indicate on plans that Level 2 EV vehicle charging stations will be provided for public use. The location of the EV station(s) shall be specified on building plans, and proper installation shall be verified by the Department of Public Works prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.	
Impact 5.7-2: Implementation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with CARB's 2008 Scoping Plan, the CCAP, or SCAG's 2012 RTP/SCS.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
5.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
Impact 5.8-1: Buildout in accordance with the Proposed Project would involve the routine transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous materials.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.8-2: Some areas within the Project Area are included on a list of hazardous materials sites.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.8-3: Some areas within the Project Area are located in the vicinity of an airport or within the jurisdiction of an Airport Land Use Plan.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.8-4: The Proposed Project could affect the implementation of an emergency response or evacuation plan.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.8-5: Portions of the Project Area are within moderate, high, and very high fire hazard zones and could expose structures and/or residences to fire danger.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
Impact 5.9-1: Implementation of the Proposed Project would comply with water quality standards and waste discharge requirements and would not substantially degrade water quality.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.9-2: Future development pursuant to the Proposed Project would interfere with groundwater recharge	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.9-3: Buildout of the Proposed Project would not substantially alter drainage patterns and would not result in substantial erosion or siltation.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.9-4: Development pursuant to the Proposed Project would not substantially change drainage patterns in Los Angeles County. While such development could increase rates or volumes of surface runoff, the changes would not result in substantial increases that would result in on-site or off-site flooding.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.9-5: Implementation of the Proposed Project could place housing within 100 year flood hazard areas.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.9-6: Parts of the Project Area are within dam inundation areas.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.9-7: Parts of the Project Area are subject to inundation by seiche or mudflow.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING			
Impact 5.10-1: Implementation of the Proposed Project would not include construction of roads or other improvements that could divide an established community.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.10-2: Implementation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with applicable plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.10-3: The Proposed Project would not conflict with the West Mojave Plan.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
5.11 MINERAL RESOURCES			
Impact 5.11-1: Development in accordance with the Proposed Project would cause the loss of availability of known mineral resources in the Project Area.	Potentially Significant	No mitigation measures are available to reduce the loss of availability of mineral resources in the Project Area.	Significant and unavoidable.
Impact 5.11-2: Buildout of the Proposed Project would cause a loss of availability of mineral resources in the Little Rock Wash area, which is designated for mineral extraction in the Adopted Los Angeles County General Plan.	Potentially Significant	No mitigation measures are available to reduce the loss of availability of mineral resources in the Project Area.	Significant and unavoidable.
Impact 5.11-3: Buildout of the Proposed Project would not cause a loss of availability of oil and natural gas reserves in the Project Area.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
5.12 NOISE			
Impact 5.12-1: Construction activities would result in temporary noise increases in the vicinity of the Proposed Project.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.12-2: Buildout of the Proposed Project would result in an increase in traffic on local roadways in the Project Area, which would substantially increase the existing ambient noise environment.	Potentially Significant	Compliance with the County's Noise Element and County Code would reduce traffic noise impacts to existing and proposed noise sensitive uses to the extent feasible. No additional feasible mitigation measures are available to further reduce impacts. Residential land uses comprise the majority of existing sensitive uses within Project Area that would be impacted by the increase in traffic generated noise levels. Construction of sound barriers would be inappropriate for residential land uses that face the roadway as it would create aesthetic and access concerns. Furthermore, for individual development projects, the cost to mitigate off-site traffic noise impacts to existing uses (such as through the construction of sound walls and/or berms) may often be out of proportion with the level of impact.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact 5.12-3: New noise-sensitive land uses associated with the Proposed Project could be exposed to elevated noise levels from mobile sources along roadways.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.12-4: The Proposed Project could create elevated levels of groundborne vibration and groundborne noise; both in the short-term (construction) and the long-term (operations).	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.12-5: The proximity of future Antelope Valley developments to an airport or airstrip would not result in exposure of future resident and/or workers to airport-related noise.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
5.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING			
Impact 5.13-1: The Proposed Project would directly result in population growth in the Project Area	Potentially Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.13-2: Project implementation would not result in the displacement of people and/or housing.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.14 PUBLIC SERVICES			
<i>FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES</i>			
<p>Impact 5.14-1: Buildout of the Proposed Project would introduce new structures, residents and employees into the LACoFD service boundaries, thereby increasing the requirement for fire protection facilities and personnel.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>PS-1 Prior to issuance of building permits, future project applicants/developers shall pay the LACoFD Developer Fee in effect at that time.</p> <p>PS-2 Each subdivision map shall comply with the applicable County Fire Code requirements for fire apparatus access roads, fire flows, and fire hydrants. Final fire flows shall be determined by LACoFD in accordance with Appendix B of the County Fire Code. The required fire apparatus road and water requirements shall be in place prior to construction.</p> <p>PS-3 Prior to approval of a tentative map, a Fuel Modification Plan shall be prepared for each subdivision map in which urban uses would permanently adjoin a natural area, as required by Section 1117.2.1 of the County Fire Code, and approved by LACoFD prior to building permit issuance.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>
<i>LAW ENFORCEMENT</i>			
<p>Impact 5.14-2: Buildout of the Proposed Project would introduce new structures, residents and employees into the LASD service boundaries, thereby increasing the requirement for law enforcement facilities and personnel.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>
<i>SCHOOL SERVICES</i>			
<p>Impact 5.14-3: Buildout of the Proposed Project would generate new students who would impact the school enrollment capacities of area schools.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
LIBRARY SERVICES			
Impact 5.14-4: Buildout of the Proposed Project would generate additional population, increasing the service needs for the local libraries.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
5.15 RECREATION			
Impact 5.15-1: Development in accordance with the Proposed Project would generate additional residents that would increase the use of existing parks and recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration may occur or be accelerated.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.15-2: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
5.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC			
Impact 5.16-1: Buildout in accordance with the Proposed Project would impact levels of service on the existing roadway system.	Potentially Significant	<p>T-1 The County shall continue to monitor potential impacts on roadway segments and intersections on a project by project basis as buildout occurs by requiring traffic studies for all projects that could significantly impact traffic and circulation patterns. Future projects shall be evaluated and traffic improvements shall be identified to maintain minimum levels of service in accordance with the County's Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines, where feasible mitigation is available.</p> <p>T-2 The County shall implement over time objectives and policies contained within the Antelope Valley Area Plan and the adopted General Plan Transportation Element. Implementation of those policies will help mitigate any potential impacts of Project growth and/or highway amendments on the transportation system.</p> <p>T-3 The County shall participate with Metro, the CMP agency in Los Angeles County, on a potential Congestion Mitigation Fee program that would replace the current CMP Debit/Credit approach. Under a countywide fee program, each jurisdiction, including the County, will select and build capital transportation projects, adopt a fee</p>	Significant and Unavoidable

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>ordinance, collect fees and control revenues. A fee program will require a nexus analysis, and apply only to net new construction on commercial and industrial space and additional residential units and needs to be approved by Metro and the local jurisdictions. A countywide fee, if adopted, will allow the County to mitigate the impacts of development via the payment of the transportation impact fee in lieu of asking each development project for individual mitigation measures, or asking for fair share payments of mitigation. The fee program would itself constitute a "fair share" program that would apply to all development (of a certain size) within the unincorporated areas.</p> <p>T-4 The County of Los Angeles shall continue to secure the funding needed to implement the future planned improvements within the Project Area. A variety of funding sources shall be explored, such as Metro's CMP Fee Program as described under T-3, Metro Call for Project funds, and federal and state grant opportunities. If the CMP fee program is not adopted by Metro and the County of Los Angeles, other funding sources for regional transportation needs in the Project Area, including Caltrans facilities, shall be pursued such as a potential North County Development Impact Fee Program, development agreements for large projects, and/or mitigation agreements between future applicants and Caltrans for projects that impact Caltrans facilities.</p> <p>T-5 The County shall work with Caltrans as they prepare plans to add additional lanes or complete other improvements to various freeways within and adjacent to unincorporated areas. This includes adding or extending mixed flow general purpose lanes, adding or extending existing HOV lanes, adding Express Lanes (high occupancy toll lanes), incorporating truck climbing lanes, improving interchanges and other freeway related improvements.</p> <p>T-6 The County shall require traffic engineering firms retained to prepare traffic impact studies for future development projects to consult with Caltrans, when a development proposal meets the requirements of statewide, regional, or areawide significance per CEQA Guidelines §15206(b). When preparing traffic impact studies, the most up to date Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies from Caltrans shall be followed. Proposed developments meeting the criteria of statewide, regional or areawide include:</p>	

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed residential developments of more than 500 dwelling units • Proposed shopping centers or business establishments employing more than 1,000 persons or encompassing more than 500,000 square feet of floor space. • Proposed commercial office buildings employing more than 1,000 persons or encompassing more than 250,000 square feet of floor space • Proposed hotel/motel developments of more than 500 rooms <p>When the CEQA criteria of regional significance are not met, Caltrans recommends that Project Applicants consult with Caltrans when a proposed development includes the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All proposed developments that have the potential to cause a significant impact to state facilities (right of way, intersections, interchanges, etc.) and when required mitigation improvements are proposed in the initial study. Mitigation concurrence should be obtained from Caltrans as early as possible. • Any development that assigns 50 or more trips (passenger car equivalent trips) during peak hours to a state highway/freeway. • Any development that assigns 10 or more trips (passenger car equivalent trips) during peak hours to an off-ramp. On/off-ramps that are very close to each other in which the project trips may cause congestion on the left-turn lane storage to the on-ramp. • Any development located adjacent to or within 100 feet of a state highway facility and may require a Caltrans Encroachment Permit. (Exceptions: additions to single family homes or 10 residential units or less). • When the County cannot determine whether or not Caltrans will expect a traffic impact analysis pursuant to CEQA. 	
<p>Impact 5.16-2: Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.16-3: Implementation of the Proposed Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment).	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.16-4: Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.16-5: Implementation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks).	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
5.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS			
Impact 5.17-1: Wastewater generated by buildout of the Proposed Project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of any of the four Regional Water Quality Control Boards having jurisdiction in Los Angeles County.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.17-2: Sanitary wastewater generated by buildout of the Proposed Project could be adequately treated by the wastewater treatment providers serving the unincorporated areas.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 5.17-3: Water supply and delivery systems are not adequate to meet Proposed Project's requirements in the Project Area beyond 2035.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p><u>Development Site Plans, Building Plans, and Landscaping Plans</u></p> <p>USS-1 USS-1 Support amendments to the County Building Code that would promote upgrades to water and energy efficiency when issuing permits for renovations or additions to existing buildings.</p> <p>USS-2 Apply water conservation policies to all pending development projects, including approved tentative subdivision maps to the extent permitted by law. Where precluded from adding requirements by vested entitlements, encourage water conservation in construction and landscape design.</p> <p>USS-3 Require new development to provide the infrastructure needed for delivery of recycled water to the property for use in irrigation, even if the recycled water main delivery lines have not yet reached the site, where deemed appropriate by the reviewing authority.</p> <p>USS-4 Promote energy efficiency and water conservation upgrades to existing non-residential buildings at the time of major remodel or additions.</p> <p>USS-5 Promote the use of permeable paving materials to allow infiltration of surface water into the water table.</p> <p>USS-6 Seek methods to decrease impermeable site area where reasonable and feasible, in order to reduce stormwater runoff and increase groundwater infiltration, including use of shared parking and other means, as appropriate.</p> <p>USS-7 On previously developed sites proposed for major alteration, provide stormwater management improvements to restore natural infiltration, as required by the reviewing authority.</p> <p>USS-8 Encourage and promote the use of new materials and technology for improved stormwater management, such as pervious paving, green roofs, rain gardens, and vegetated swales.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>USS-9 Evaluate development proposals for consistency with the County Green Building Standards Code.</p> <p>USS-10 Evaluate development proposals for consistency with Low Impact Development Code on development sites, including but not limited to minimizing impervious surface area and promoting infiltration, in order to reduce the flow and velocity of stormwater runoff throughout the watershed.</p> <p><i>Water Supply Planning and Water Conservation</i></p> <p>USS-18 USS-11 Require that all new development proposals demonstrate a sufficient and sustainable water supply prior to approval, consistent with County Department of Public Health requirements.</p> <p>USS-12 Monitor growth, and coordinate with water districts as needed to ensure that long-range needs for potable and reclaimed water will be met.</p> <p>USS-13 If water supplies are reduced from projected levels due to drought, emergency, or other unanticipated events, take appropriate steps to limit, reduce, or otherwise modify growth permitted by the Area Plan in consultation with water districts to ensure adequate long-term supply for existing businesses and residents.</p> <p>USS-14 Upon the availability of non-potable water, discourage and consider restrictions on the use of potable water for washing outdoor surfaces.</p> <p>USS-15 In cooperation with the Sanitation Districts and other affected agencies, expand opportunities for use of recycled water for the purposes of landscape maintenance, construction, water recharge, and other uses as appropriate.</p>	

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.17-4: Existing and/or proposed facilities would be able to accommodate project-generated solid waste and comply with related solid waste regulations.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant
Impact 5.17-5: Existing and/or proposed facilities would be able to accommodate project-generated utility demands.	Less Than Significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less Than Significant

1. Executive Summary

This page intentionally left blank.