



Los Angeles County Clerk
Environmental Filings
12400 Imperial Hwy., Rm. 2001
Norwalk, CA 90650

FROM: City of Palmdale
Planning Division
38250 Sierra Highway
Palmdale, CA 93550

Office of Planning and Research
P.O. Box 3044
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

CONTACT: Megan Taggart
Planning Manager
(661) 267-5200

SUBJECT: Filing of Notice of Determination in Compliance With Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code

State Clearinghouse Number: 2021030139

Project No.: TPM 83189, CUP 21-001, SPR 21-001 (Pilot Travel Center)

Project Applicant: Pilot Travel Centers LLC

Project Location (include county): Approximately 28-acre parcel (APN 3051-021-022) generally located north of Pearblossom Highway and west of Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 in the City of Palmdale, County of Los Angeles, California.

Project Description: The Project proposes a TPM, CUP, SPR, and the construction and operation of a Pilot Travel Center, including off-site improvements, for primarily highway travel serving uses.

This is to advise that the City of Palmdale (Lead Agency or Responsible Agency) has approved the above-described project on April 8, 2021, and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project.

- 1. The project [will not] have a significant effect on the environment.
2. An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures [were] made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A mitigation reporting or monitoring plan [was] adopted for the project.
5. A Statement of Overriding Considerations [was not] adopted for this project.
6. Findings [were] made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

THIS NOTICE WAS POSTED
ON April 13 2021
UNTIL May 13 2021

REGISTRAR - RECORDER/COUNTY CLERK

2021 087216
FILED
Apr 13 2021

Dean C. Logan, Registrar - Recorder/County Clerk
Electronically signed by ANNA MOWBISYAN



# PALMDALE

*a place to call home*

April 20, 2021

STEVEN D. HOFBAUER  
*Mayor*

LAURA BETTENCOURT  
*Mayor Pro Tem*

AUSTIN BISHOP  
*Councilmember*

JUAN CARRILLO  
*Councilmember*

RICHARD J. LOA  
*Councilmember*

38300 Sierra Highway

Palmdale, CA 93550-4798

Tel: 661/267-5200

Fax: 661/267-5233

TDD: 661/267-5167

Mr. Ross Shaver  
Pilot Travel Centers, LLC  
5508 Lonas Drive  
Knoxville, TN 37909

**RE: TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP 83189, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 21-001 AND SITE PLAN REVIEW 21-001; A REQUEST TO SUBDIVIDE ONE PARCEL INTO THREE PARCELS AND TO CONSTRUCT A COMMERCIAL TRAVEL CENTER LOCATED NORTH OF PEARBLOSSOM HIGHWAY AND WEST OF FORT TEJON ROAD/HIGHWAY 138 (APN: 3051-021-022)**

Dear Mr. Shaver:

Enclosed is the original Environmental Filing Fee Cash Receipt from the Los Angeles County Recorder's Office for the above-referenced project. Please retain this receipt for your records.

If you have any questions regarding this project, please contact Assistant Planner Jasmine Alvarado at [jalvarado@cityofpalmdale.org](mailto:jalvarado@cityofpalmdale.org) / (661) 267-5287.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lynn O'Brien".

Lynn O'Brien  
Administrative Assistant

Enclosure

*Auxiliary aids provided for*

*communication accessibility*

*on 72 hours notice and request.*

Dean C. Logan  
Los Angeles County Registrar / Recorder  
12400 Imperial Highway, Norwalk, CA  
(800)201-8999

BUSINESS FILINGS REGISTRATION

NORWALK DEPARTMENT HEADQUARTER

Cashier: A. MOVSISYAN



\* 2 0 2 1 0 4 1 3 0 5 8 0 0 0 8 \*

Tuesday, April 13, 2021 11:25 AM

Item(s)

| <u>Fee</u>                              | <u>Qty</u> | <u>Total</u>      |
|---|------------|-------------------|
| NoD - County Posting Fee<br>2021087216  | 1          | \$75.00           |
| NoD - Negative Declaratio<br>2021087216 | 1          | \$2,480.25        |
| <b>Total</b>                            |            | <b>\$2,555.25</b> |

Total Documents: 1

Customer payment(s):

Check \$2,555.25

Check List:

#3444783 \$2,555.25

State of California—Natural Resources Agency  
 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE  
**2021 ENVIRONMENTAL FILING FEE CASH RECEIPT**

|  |
|--|
| RECEIPT #<br>202104130580008                         |
| STATE CLEARING HOUSE # (If applicable)<br>2021030139 |

EE INSTRUCTIONS ON REVERSE. TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY


|  |                  |             |                               |
|--|------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|
| LEAD AGENCY<br>CITY OF PALMDALE PLANNING DIVISION  |                  |             | DATE<br>04/13/2021            |
| COUNTY/STATE AGENCY OF FILING<br>LACC  |                  |             | DOCUMENT NUMBER<br>2021087216 |
| PROJECT TITLE<br>TPM 83189, CUP 21-001, SPR 21-001 (PILOT TRAVEL CENTER)   |                  |             |                               |
| PROJECT APPLICANT NAME<br>MEGAN TAGGART  |                  |             | PHONE NUMBER                  |
| PROJECT APPLICANT ADDRESS<br>38250 SIERRA HIGHWAY  | CITY<br>PALMDALE | STATE<br>CA | ZIP CODE<br>93550             |
| PROJECT APPLICANT (Check appropriate box):<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Public Agency <input type="checkbox"/> School District <input type="checkbox"/> Other Special District <input type="checkbox"/> State Agency <input type="checkbox"/> Private Entity |                  |             |                               |

**CHECK APPLICABLE FEES:**

|   |            |             |
|---|------------|-------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Impact Report (EIR)  | \$3,445.25 | \$ 0.00     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Negative Declaration (ND)(MND)                                  | \$2,480.25 | \$ 2,480.25 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Application Fee Water Diversion (State Water Resources Control Board Only) | \$850.00   | \$ 0.00     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Projects Subject to Certified Regulatory Programs (CRP)                    | \$1,171.25 | \$ 0.00     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> County Administrative Fee                                       | \$50.00    | \$ 75.00    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Project that is exempt from fees   |            |             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Exemption  |            |             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CDFW No Effect Determination (Form Attached)                               |            |             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____  |            | \$ 0.00     |

**PAYMENT METHOD:**

Cash   
  Credit   
  Check   
  Other \_\_\_\_\_   
 \$ 2,555.25

|   |              |
|---|--------------|
| SIGNATURE<br><b>X</b>  | TITLE<br>ITC |
|---|--------------|



Los Angeles County Clerk  
Environmental Filings  
12400 Imperial Hwy., Rm. 2001  
Norwalk, CA 90650

FROM: City of Palmdale  
Planning Division  
38250 Sierra Highway  
Palmdale, CA 93550

Office of Planning and Research  
P.O. Box 3044  
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

CONTACT: Megan Taggart  
Planning Manager  
(661) 267-5200

**SUBJECT: Filing of Notice of Determination in Compliance With Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code**

State Clearinghouse Number: 2021030139

Project No.: TPM 83189, CUP 21-001, SPR 21-001 (Pilot Travel Center)

Project Applicant: Pilot Travel Centers LLC

Project Location (include county): Approximately 28-acre parcel (APN 3051-021-022) generally located north of Pearblossom Highway and west of Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 in the City of Palmdale, County of Los Angeles, California.

Project Description: The Project proposes a TPM, CUP, SPR, and the construction and operation of a Pilot Travel Center, including off-site improvements, for primarily highway travel serving uses.


This is to advise that the City of Palmdale ( Lead Agency or  Responsible Agency) has approved the above-described project on April 8, 2021, and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project.

1. The project [ will  will not] have a significant effect on the environment.
2.  An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.  
 A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures [ were  were not] made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A mitigation reporting or monitoring plan [ was  was not] adopted for the project.
5. A Statement of Overriding Considerations [ was  was not] adopted for this project.
6. Findings [ were  were not] made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.


Notice of Determination  
Project No. TPM 83189, CUP 21-001, SPR 21-001  
April 8, 2021

This is to certify that the final Mitigated Negative Declaration with comments and responses and record of project approval, or the Negative Declaration is available to the General Public at: City of Palmdale Planning Division, 38250 Sierra Highway, Palmdale, CA 93550.

Signature (Public Agency):



\_\_\_\_\_  
Megan Taggart, Planning Manager  
City of Palmdale



\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code.  
Reference: Sections 21000-21174, Public Resources Code.



# PILOT TRAVEL CENTER PROJECT

(CASE No. TPM 83189, CUP 21-001, SPR 21-001)

PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT

INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

MARCH 2021

*Prepared for:*

City of Palmdale  
Economic & Community Development Department  
Planning Division  
38250 Sierra Highway  
Palmdale, CA 93550

*Prepared by:*

De Novo Planning Group  
180 E. Main Street, Suite 108  
Tustin, CA 92780

D e N o v o P l a n n i n g G r o u p

---

A Land Use Planning, Design, and Environmental Firm



# CITY OF PALMDALE

## **Pilot Travel Center**

(Case No. TPM 83189, CUP 21-001, SPR 21-001)

### INITIAL STUDY / MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

---

*Prepared for:*

CITY OF PALMDALE  
38250 SIERRA HIGHWAY  
PALMDALE, CA 93550

*Prepared by:*

DE NOVO PLANNING GROUP  
180 S. MAIN STREET, SUITE 108  
TUSTIN, CALIFORNIA 92780

MARCH 2021



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1. INTRODUCTION                                    | 5   |
| 2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION                             | 6   |
| 3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST                         | 16  |
| A. Background.....                                 | 17  |
| B. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected..... | 19  |
| C. Determination.....                              | 20  |
| D. Evaluation of Environmental Impacts.....        | 21  |
| 4. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS                          | 22  |
| I AESTHETICS.....                                  | 22  |
| II AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.....         | 28  |
| III AIR QUALITY.....                               | 30  |
| IV BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.....                       | 37  |
| V CULTURAL RESOURCES.....                          | 52  |
| VI ENERGY.....                                     | 56  |
| VII GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.....                  | 58  |
| VIII GEOLOGY AND SOILS.....                        | 64  |
| IX HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.....            | 70  |
| X HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.....                 | 80  |
| XI LAND USE AND PLANNING.....                      | 86  |
| XII MINERAL RESOURCES.....                         | 89  |
| XIII NOISE.....                                    | 90  |
| XIV POPULATION AND HOUSING.....                    | 105 |
| XV PUBLIC SERVICES.....                            | 107 |
| XVI RECREATION.....                                | 110 |
| XVII TRANSPORTATION.....                           | 111 |
| XVIII TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.....               | 119 |
| XIX UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.....             | 122 |
| XX WILDFIRE.....                                   | 128 |
| XXI MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.....        | 131 |
| 5. REFERENCES                                      | 134 |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

### FIGURES

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Figure 1: Project Location .....                 | 7  |
| Figure 2: Project Site and Surrounding Area..... | 8  |
| Figure 3: Proposed Tentative Parcel Map .....    | 12 |
| Figure 4: Proposed Site Plan (South).....        | 14 |
| Figure 5: Proposed Site Plan (North) .....       | 15 |

### TABLES

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Table 1: Project Construction Criteria Pollutant Emissions (tons/year) .....              | 31  |
| Table 2: Project Construction Criteria Pollutant Emissions (pounds/day).....              | 32  |
| Table 3: Project Operational Criteria Pollutant Emissions (tons/year) .....               | 32  |
| Table 4: Project Operational Criteria Pollutant Emissions (maximum pounds/day).....       | 33  |
| Table 5: Summary of Maximum Health Risks .....  | 35  |
| Table 6: Special Status Plant Species.....  | 38  |
| Table 7: Special Status Animal Species.....   | 41  |
| Table 8: Project Construction and Operational GHG Emissions (tons/year) .....             | 63  |
| Table 9: Project Construction and Operational GHG Emissions (maximum pounds/day)<br>..... | 63  |
| Table 10: Maximum Acceptable Noise Levels.....  | 96  |
| Table 11: Typical Construction Noise Levels .....   | 98  |
| Table 12: Construction Noise Levels by Phase (dBA, Leq).....                              | 99  |
| Table 13: Project Change in Existing Traffic Noise Levels .....                           | 100 |
| Table 14: Guideline Vibration Damage Potential Threshold Criteria .....                   | 102 |
| Table 15: Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment .....                        | 103 |

### APPENDICES

|   |  |
|---|--|
| A | Photometric Plan   |
| B | Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Data |
| C | Cultural Resources Study (Confidential)                              |
| D | Geotechnical Studies   |
| E | Hazardous Materials Studies  |
| F | Noise Study  |
| G | Transportation Analysis  |
| H | Sewer Area Study   |
| I | Preliminary Hydrology Report   |
| J | Mitigation Monitoring Program and Compliance Record                  |

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **A. Purpose and Background of the Initial Study**

Pursuant to Section 15063 of the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines* (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Section 15000 et seq.), this Initial Study is a preliminary environmental analysis prepared for use by the Lead Agency (City of Palmdale) as a basis for determining whether an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), a Negative Declaration (ND), or a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is required for the project. CEQA Guidelines require that an Initial Study contain a project description of environmental setting, identification of environmental effects by checklist or other similar form, explanation of environmental effects, discussion of mitigation for significant environmental effects, evaluation of the project's consistency with existing, applicable land use controls, and the name of persons who prepared the study.

Based on the analysis contained in this Initial Study, it has been determined that the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels with mitigation incorporated. Therefore, preparation of a Mitigated Negative Declaration is appropriate for the project.

### **B. Lead Agency**

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

### **C. Technical Studies**

- Air Toxics Health Risk Assessment, De Novo Planning Group
- Cultural Resources Study, Anza Resource Consultants
- Geotechnical Evaluation Report, Geotechnical Solutions, Inc.
- Geotechnical Addendum Report, Geotechnical Solutions, Inc.
- Geotechnical Engineering Percolation/Infiltration Test Report, Geotechnical Solutions, Inc.
- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Broadbent
- Asbestos Inspection Report, Broadbent
- Noise Impact Study, MD Acoustics
- Traffic Study for Pilot Travel Center, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
- Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
- Sewer Area Study, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
- Preliminary Hydrology & Hydraulics Report, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

## **2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

### **A. Project Location**



The Project site consists of an approximately 28-acre parcel (referred to herein as the 28-acre parcel or parent parcel) generally located north of Pearblossom Highway and west of Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 in the City of Palmdale; refer to Figure 1, Project Location and Figure 2, Project Site and Surrounding Area.

### **B. Project Setting**

The 28-acre parcel is designated Regional Commercial (RC) by the City of Palmdale General Plan and is zoned C-4 (Commercial Center) by the City of Palmdale Zoning Map. The Project site is comprised of an existing swap meet use with buildings/structures associated with the swap meet operations located within the eastern portion of the site and parking located within the western portion of the site. There is a small wooden outpost structure and signage located adjacent to the parking area and Pearblossom Highway. Trees are distributed throughout the Project site and trees/bushes are located along the property boundary adjacent to Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 and a portion of the property boundary adjacent to Pearblossom Highway. There are several driveways/entrances providing access to the Project site from Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 and Pearblossom Highway. All of the driveways currently have moveable barrier gates.


### **C. Proposed Actions Addressed in the IS/MND**

The proposed Project actions addressed in this document include a Tentative Parcel Map (TPM 8319), Conditional Use Permit (CUP 21-001), Site Plan Review (SPR 21-001), and the construction and operation of the Pilot Travel Center, including off-site improvements, as described below.



**Legend**

- Project Site/Parent Parcel (3051-021-022)
- Pilot Travel Center Site
- Palmdale City Limits



**CITY OF PALMDALE - PILOT TRAVEL CENTER  
INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

Figure 1. Project Location

Sources: Los Angeles County; California State Geoportal. Map date: February 26, 2021.






**Legend**

- Project Site/Parent Parcel (3051-021-022)
- Pilot Travel Center Site
- Palmdale City Limits
- Proposed Project Improvements

Sources: Los Angeles County; ArcGIS Online NAIP Imagery  
Map Service; Kimley Horn. Map date: February 26, 2021.



**CITY OF PALMDALE - PILOT TRAVEL CENTER  
INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

**Figure 2.  
Project Site and Surrounding Area**

## **D. Project Components**

### Tentative Parcel Map

The Project proposes a Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) to subdivide the existing 28-acre parent parcel into three parcels; refer to Figure 3, Proposed Tentative Parcel Map.

The approximately 9-acre western parcel is proposed to be developed with a Pilot Travel Center, as described below. With the exception of the proposed roadway improvements (refer to the *Offsite Roadway Improvements*, discussion below), the other two parcels would remain unchanged at this time.

### Pilot Travel Center

The Project proposes the construction and operation of a Pilot Travel Center on the approximately 9-acre parcel for regional and local highway traveling users. Implementation of the Pilot Travel Center would involve the development of fueling facilities, travel amenities, restaurants, and parking facilities for passing motorists and commercial truck operators, as described below; refer to Figure 4, Proposed Site Plan.

#### *Fueling Facilities*

The Project proposes eight diesel fueling lanes/positions and seven gas islands with 14 fueling positions. Two aboveground diesel storage farms, a Bio-blending shed, below ground gasoline storage tanks, and a truck scale would also be constructed.

#### *Travel Center Building*

The proposed travel center building would be up to 12,000 square feet and include a convenience store, quick service restaurants, driver amenities (e.g., restrooms, showers, laundry), and support/utility areas.

#### *Parking Facilities*

The Project would provide 123 parking spaces (56 automobile, 3 ADA, 64 truck) with passenger automobile and handicapped parking located adjacent to the travel center facility and gas islands. Truck parking would be located north of the travel center facility and truck diesel fueling lanes.

Primary access to the Pilot Travel Center site would be provided from Pearblossom Highway. Additional access is proposed from Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 via a one-way roadway which would extend southwest from Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 and connect to a shared access roadway at the northeast corner of the Pilot Travel Center

site; refer to the *Offsite Roadway Improvements* discussion below.

#### *Offsite Roadway Improvements*

Pearblossom Highway is proposed to be widened to its ultimate half-width right-of-way (ROW) from the Pilot Travel Center site's western property line to the proposed travel center's easterly property line, which includes the shared roadway. At the intersection of the shared roadway and Pearblossom Highway, a traffic signal would be installed. Along the entire frontage of the Pilot Travel Center a sidewalk would be installed with curb and gutter.

The proposed one-way access from Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 would be provided by installing a right turn pocket along Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 and would consist of road surface and curbs only; no sidewalk or gutters are proposed. The Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 access would be granted through use of easements for shared access.

#### *Conditional Use Permit*

The Project would require approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) prior to Project approval to allow for the gas/fueling station within the C-4 zone and for the alcoholic beverage license.

## **E. Regulatory Requirements, Permits, and Approvals**

The City of Palmdale, as the Lead Agency, has discretionary authority over the proposed Project. The Project would be subject to various City permits and approvals including, but not limited to:

- Tentative Parcel Map;
- Conditional Use Permit;
- Site Plan Review (SPR);
- Grading Permit; and
- Building Permit.

Other governmental agencies that may be required to issue permits or approve certain aspects of the Project include, but are not limited to:

- Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) – Construction related air quality permits.
- Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) – Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) approval prior to construction activities.
- Los Angeles County Fire Department – Land Development review.




Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration  
Pilot Travel Center (Case No. TPM 83189, CUP 21-001, SPR 21-001)  
March 1, 2021  
Page 11

- Los Angeles County Fire Department Health Hazardous Materials Division as the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA).
- Palmdale Water District – Water connections and service


Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration  
Pilot Travel Center (Case No. TPM 83189, CUP 21-001, SPR 21-001)  
March 1, 2021  
Page 12

This page intentionally left blank.



**Legend**

- Project Site/Parent Parcel (3051-021-022)
- Pilot Travel Center Site




**CITY OF PALMDALE - PILOT TRAVEL CENTER  
INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

**Figure 3. Tentative Parcel Map (North)**

Sources: Kimley Horn 02/24/2021. Map date: February 26, 2021.





**Legend**

- Project Site/Parent Parcel (3051-021-022)
- Pilot Travel Center Site



**CITY OF PALMDALE - PILOT TRAVEL CENTER  
INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

**Figure 5. Proposed Site Plan**

Sources: Kimley Horn 2/25/2021. Map date: February 26, 2021.

Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration  
Pilot Travel Center (Case No. TPM 83189, CUP 21-001, SPR 21-001)  
March 1, 2021  
Page 16

This page intentionally left blank.

### **3. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

#### **A. Background**

**1. Project Title:**

Pilot Travel Center (Case No. TPM 83189, CUP 21-001, SPR 21-001)

**2. Lead Agency Name and Address:**

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

**3. Contact Person and Phone Number:**

Megan Taggart, Planning Manager  
City of Palmdale  
Economic and Community Development Department  
Planning Division  
38250 Sierra Highway  
Palmdale, CA 93550  
(661) 267-5200

**4. Project Location:**

The Project site consists of an approximately 28-acre parcel generally located north of Pearblossom Highway and west of Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 in the City of Palmdale; refer to Figure 1 and Figure 2.

**5. Project Applicant's Name and Address:**

Pilot Travel Centers LLC  
Ross Shaver  
5508 Lonas Drive  
Knoxville, TN 37909  
(865) 297-9217

**6. Existing Land Use / Zoning / General Plan:**

|       | <b>SURROUNDING LAND USE</b>  | <b>ZONING</b>   | <b>GENERAL PLAN</b>   |
|-------|--|---|---|
| SITE  | Swap meet and associated parking   | Regional Commercial (RC)  | C-4 (Commercial Center)   |
| NORTH | Elevated railroad track and berm; north of the railroad is vacant land   | Regional Commercial (RC); Single Family Residential (SFR-3)                                 | C-4 (Commercial Center); R-1-7,000 (Single Family Residential, minimum 7,000 square foot lot size)  |
| SOUTH | Pearblossom Highway; single-family residences and undeveloped land within unincorporated Los Angeles County; south and east of 53 <sup>rd</sup> Street are undeveloped parcels within the City of Palmdale | Unincorporated Los Angeles County jurisdiction; Regional Commercial (RC) (City of Palmdale) | Unincorporated Los Angeles County jurisdiction; C-4 (Commercial Center) (City of Palmdale)          |
| EAST  | Gas station; Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138   | Regional Commercial (RC)  | C-4 (Commercial Center)   |
| WEST  | Undeveloped land; Palmdale Water District facility; single family residential subdivision  | Medium Residential (MR); Single Family Residential (SFR-3)                                  | R-2 (Medium Residential); R-1-7,000 (Single Family Residential, minimum 7,000 square foot lot size) |

**7. Description of Project:**

The Project proposes a TPM, CUP, SPR, and the construction and operation of a Pilot Travel Center, including off-site improvements, for primarily highway travel serving uses; refer to Section 2.D, Project Components, above.

**8. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

Immediately north of the Project site is a berm and elevated railroad track. Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 extends in a northwest/southeast direction east of the Project site and forms the eastern boundary of the 28-acre parent parcel. A gas station is located



on the northwest corner of Pearblossom Highway and Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138. South of the Project site, across Pearblossom Highway, are single-family residences surrounded by undeveloped land within unincorporated Los Angeles County and undeveloped parcels within the City of Palmdale designated RC and zoned C-4. Immediately to the west of the Project site is undeveloped land (three parcels) designated Medium Residential and zoned R-2 (Medium Residential); a single-family residential subdivision is located further west.

## **B. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact”, as indicated by the checklist on the following pages. Potentially significant impacts that are mitigated to “Less Than Significant” are now shown here.

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                                   |
|  |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions            | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials    | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning               | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing              | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                                    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation           | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resource | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire                           |  |

### C. Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation: (Select one)

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect: 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards; and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated”. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

This initial study was prepared by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Starla Barker, AICP  
Principal Planner  
De Novo Planning Group

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Megan Taggart  
Planning Manager  
City of Palmdale

## **D. Evaluation of Environmental Impacts**

Each of the responses in the following environmental checklist considers the whole action involved, including project-level, cumulative, on-site, off-site, indirect, construction, and operational impacts. A brief explanation is provided for all answers and supported by the information sources cited.

1. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone).
2. A “Less Than Significant Impact” applies when the proposed project would not result in a substantial and adverse change in the environment. This impact level does not require mitigation measures.
3. A “Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated” applies when the proposed project would not result in a substantial and adverse change in the environment after additional mitigation measures are applied.
4. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

#### 4. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                           |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>I AESTHETICS</b>   |                                |   |                                     |                                     |
| Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the Project:   |                                |   |                                     |                                     |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

#### Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

##### a) *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Palmdale General Plan Environmental Resources Element describes scenic resources, including locally-designated scenic highways that occur within the City. In general, the Environmental Resources Element describes scenic areas as including open space and landscaped corridors and viewsheds. They provide visual enhancement and pleasure and are worthy of preservation for aesthetic, historical, topographical, cultural or biological reasons. Scenic areas in the valley area include the Angeles National Forest south and west of the City and wildlife reserves east of the City. The General Plan further describes scenic backdrops as the significant ridgelines of the San Gabriels, the Sierra Pelona and the Ritter and Portal Ridges that form the City’s skyline views.

A scenic vista is generally defined as a view of undisturbed natural lands exhibiting a unique or unusual feature that comprises an important or dominant portion of the viewshed. Scenic vistas may also be represented by a particular distant view that provides visual relief from less attractive views of nearby features. Other designated federal and State lands, as well as local open space or recreational areas, may also offer scenic vistas if they represent a valued aesthetic view within

the surrounding landscape.

There are no state-designated scenic highways within the City of Palmdale; refer to Response I(b). The Project site is located immediately north of Pearblossom Highway. The Environmental Resources Element identifies Pearblossom Highway as a locally-designated scenic highway.

Within the Project area, scenic views and vistas are primarily long-range views of the San Gabriel Mountains to the south and west of the Project site. These views are afforded to motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians traveling on Pearblossom Highway. Development of the proposed travel center would not alter existing views of the San Gabriel Mountains from Pearblossom Highway, as the Project site is located north of Pearblossom Highway and the San Gabriel Mountains are located to the south and west. Additionally, long-range views of the San Gabriel Mountains across the Project site from the north would not be impeded, as views of the Project site are obstructed from the elevated railroad track that forms the site's northern border. Existing views north of Pearblossom Highway within the Project area do not contain a scenic vista and are primarily comprised of existing residential and commercial development that occurs in this area. Development of the travel center would be consistent with development that occurs along Pearblossom Highway within the area. The Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista and impacts would be less than significant.

**b) *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?***

**No Impact.** There are no state scenic highways adjacent to the Project site or within the surrounding area. Angeles Crest Highway (State Route 2) from the La Canada/Angeles National Forest boundary to the San Bernardino County boundary has been officially designated as a State Scenic Highway by the California Department of Transportation. At its closest point, Angeles Crest Highway is located just over 14 miles south of the Project site. The Highway is located within the Angeles National Forest and views of the Project site are not readily available due to the distance and intervening topography. The proposed Project would not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

**c) *In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

Short-Term Visual Character/Quality

Short-term construction-related activities associated with the proposed Pilot Travel Center would

temporarily alter the existing visual character of the Project site and surrounding area. The visual impact associated with construction activities would involve graded surfaces, construction materials, and equipment. Equipment for grading activities would be staged within the Project site and materials storage areas and/or construction debris piles may be visible at staging areas. Exposed trenches, roadway bedding, spoils/debris piles, and steel plates would be visible during construction of proposed roadway and utility infrastructure improvements. These construction activities and equipment could temporarily degrade the existing visual character and quality of the Project area during the construction phase.

Views of the construction activities and staging areas on the Project site would be visible from adjacent parcels, including from residential uses to the west and south, and motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians traveling along Pearblossom Highway. However, views of construction activities would be short-term (approximately four months) and views of construction activities and staging would cease upon completion of Project construction. Impacts would be less than significant.

#### Long-Term Visual Character/Quality

The Project site is comprised of an existing swap meet use with buildings/structures associated with the swap meet operations located within the eastern portion of the site and parking located within the western portion of the site. Trees are distributed within the parking aisles throughout the Project site and trees/bushes are located along the property boundary adjacent to Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 and a portion of the property boundary adjacent to Pearblossom Highway. The Project site does not have any noted aesthetic value, nor does it offer a high degree of visual quality or character. Due to the topography of the site and surrounding area and existing development, public views of the Project site primarily occur from roadways to the south and west of the Project site.

Views of and across the site from Pearblossom Highway and north/south trending roadways that terminate at Pearblossom Highway are relatively unobstructed. Foreground views of the Project site primarily consist of a gravel parking lot with trees within the western portion of the site with limited views of structures within the eastern portion of the site due to the trees/bushes adjacent to Pearblossom Highway. Middle ground views are also comprised of gravel parking area and landscaping and are somewhat limited due to the landscaping adjacent to Pearblossom Highway and the berm and elevated railroad track that forms the site's northern border. Long range views from Pearblossom Highway across the site primarily consist of skyline.

Similarly, publicly accessible views of the Project site from the residential subdivision to the west (from Fallingstar Place and the terminus of Spyglass Drive) are unobstructed. Foreground views primarily consist of natural open space associated with the adjacent undeveloped parcels. Middle ground views consist of the gravel parking lot and trees within the Project site and structures associated with parent parcel. Long range views are of the skyline and San Gabriel Mountains to the south.

Publicly accessible views of and across the site from Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 are relatively unobstructed of the northern portion of the site and consist of gravel parking lot with trees. Views of the southern portion of the site are primarily obstructed due to the trees/bushes located adjacent to the Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138. Long-range views are of the skyline and San Gabriel Mountains to the south and west.

Development of the Pilot Travel Center, as proposed, would alter the visual character of the site as a portion of the existing gravel parking lot would be developed with a travel center and associated facilities. Although views of the site would be altered, the proposed travel center would be consistent with the General Plan Regional Commercial (RC) land use designation and C-4 (Commercial Center) zoning identified for the site. Publicly accessible views from Pearblossom Highway and roadways to the south would be altered, but would not be significantly degraded, as the proposed travel center would replace an existing gravel parking lot. Views of the proposed travel center from Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 would be limited due to the existing landscaping along the property boundary and intervening structures associated with the existing swap meet. The proposed Project would be required to comply with the C-4 development standards, as described in Palmdale Municipal Code (PMC) Section 14.54.100, *Standards of Development*. The standards include, but are not limited to, building height, maximum lot coverage, building setbacks and landscaping requirements. The tallest building structure within the site would be 28 feet; this would be less than the four story, 55-foot height limit allowed in the C-4 zone. The travel center would be a single structure of up to 12,000 square feet and the fuel canopy would be open on all sides; therefore, the proposed structures would not overwhelm the site. In compliance with PMC Section 17.54.100, the proposed Project would be setback 30 feet and would provide a 20-foot landscape setback adjacent to Pearblossom Highway, which would improve the visual character along the Project site's frontage.

Publicly accessible views of the Project site from the residential subdivision to the west (from Fallingstar Place and the terminus of Spyglass Drive) would be primarily shielded due to the intervening undeveloped parcels and the proposed berm and wall combination located within the Project site. Although views of the automobile fueling area would be primarily shielded due to the intervening wall, the long-range views of the San Gabriel Mountains would continue to be afforded. Depending upon the orientation of the viewer, middle ground views may be partially interrupted by the proposed travel center and canopy structure within the Project site; however, the interruption would be limited. The proposed Project would also provide a 10-foot landscape setback and 20-foot building setback from the western property line consistent with PMC Section 17.54.100, which would further contribute toward maintaining existing long-range views within the area.

Although the visual character and quality of public views of the site would be altered, they would not be substantially degraded. As stated, the Project would be consistent with the General Plan and Zoning for the site and proposed improvements associated with the travel center would be required to comply with the development standards, which would further ensure the visual character and quality of public views of the Project site would not be substantially degraded. In

addition to compliance with the development standards established by the PMC, the Project would be subject to SPR approval and approval of a CUP. Pursuant to PMC Chapter 17.21, *Site Plan Review*, the Site Plan Review process would “ensure that the site plan, building layout, size, shape, scale, mass, height, architectural design, architectural components, materials, colors, landscaping and other aspects of the physical plan for the development project are compatible with neighboring developments, are appropriate for the site, and achieve the highest level of design that is feasible for the project.” The intent of the Site Plan Review process is to “improve the aesthetic character of the community, preserve and enhance property values, protect adjacent properties from adverse impacts caused by development projects, assist private and public developers to be more cognizant of public concerns for the aesthetics of projects, and bring about a community that is safe, functional and attractive”. Pursuant to PMC Chapter 17.22, *Conditional Use Permits*, the CUP process would provide an opportunity for public review and evaluation of site-specific requirements and characteristics, to provide adequate mitigation of any potentially adverse impacts, and to ensure that all site development regulations and performance standards are provided in accordance with the PMC. In addition, the CUP ensures ongoing compliance with conditions of operation which may be applied to the use in order to protect public health, safety and welfare, and to ensure compliance with the General Plan goals, objectives and policies. In addition to a CUP to allow for the gas/fueling station within the C-4 zone, the Project would require a CUP for proposed alcohol sales in accordance with PMC Section 17.92.070. The purpose of the CUP is to establish specific standards for alcoholic beverage establishments to ensure that such businesses are appropriately located and operated so as not to pose a significant threat to the public health, safety, peace and welfare. Thus, compliance with the PMC would further ensure the Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings and impacts would be less than significant.

**d) *Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Development of a portion of the Project site with a travel center would introduce additional lighting when compared to existing conditions. Lighting within the Project site is limited to security and safety lighting distributed throughout the parking aisles and associated with the swap meeting buildings/structures. Light sources within the Project area are primarily from vehicles traveling on Pearblossom Highway and Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138, residential uses to the west and south, and commercial uses to the east.

The proposed Project would introduce interior lighting associated with the travel center building, lighting within the fueling areas, security and safety lighting around the building and throughout the site’s parking areas, lighting associated with the proposed signage, as well as lighting from trucks and automobiles accessing the site. The proposed traffic signal at Pearblossom Highway and the proposed shared roadway along the eastern side of the travel center site would also introduce new lighting within the area. The new lighting sources would generally appear similar in character to the existing developed uses east of the site at the signalized intersection of Pearblossom Highway and Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138.



PMC Section 17.86.030, *Lighting Requirements*, establishes lighting requirements including, but not limited to, ensuring lighting fixtures abutting residential zones within a distance of 150 feet from the zone boundary shall not exceed 15 feet in height and that care is given in these areas to avoid glare and light spread. With the exception that lighting fixtures within a distance of 150 feet from the residential zone boundary shall not exceed 15 feet in height, within commercial zones on sites that are less than 20 acres, such as the Pilot Travel Center site, light fixtures shall not exceed 25 feet in height; and exterior lighting standards and fixtures should be located and designed to minimize direct glare beyond the site boundaries. Lighting fixtures shall be cut-off fixtures to confine light spread within the site boundaries and there shall be no illumination or glare from the exterior lighting system onto adjacent properties or streets. An exterior lighting (photometric) plan must be prepared by an electrical engineer for new development, as required by the reviewing authority.

A photometric plan has been prepared for the proposed Project; refer to Appendix A, Photometric Plan. The photometric plan indicates that Project proposed lighting would be contained within the Project site. Security lighting is currently located within the parking area and therefore, the Project would not be introducing lighting in an area where it does not already occur. The lighting within the Project site would not directly illuminate the existing residential uses to the west of the Project site; lighting would be partially shielded from the residential uses to the west due to the distance from the site associated with the intervening parcels, required setbacks, and the proposed berm and wall within the Project site. Thus, the Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area and impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact                           |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>II AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES</b><br>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997), prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the Project: |                                |   |                              |                                     |
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

### Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

- a) ***Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?***

**No Impact.** According to the California Department of Conservation California Important Farmland Finder, the Project site is identified as Other Land.<sup>1</sup> This category is for land not included

<sup>1</sup> California Department of Conservation, *California Important Farmland Finder*, [DLRP Important Farmland Finder \(ca.gov\)](https://www.dcr.ca.gov/important-farmland-finder/), accessed July 29, 2020.

in any other mapping category and in addition to other uses, includes vacant and nonagricultural land surrounded on all sides by urban development. The Project site and surrounding area are not used for agriculture. Although land to the south of the Project site, within the County of Los Angeles, is zoned for agricultural use, it is not currently used for agriculture use or in agricultural production. The Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to non-agricultural use.

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

**No Impact.** The Project site is zoned C-4 (Commercial Center) by the City of Palmdale Zoning Map; the C-4 zone does not allow for agricultural uses. The Project site is not within a Williamson Act contract. Thus, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

**c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?**

**No Impact.** As stated, the Project site is zoned C-4 (Commercial Center) by the City of Palmdale Zoning Map. The Project is not zoned for forestland or timberland and there is no land within the surrounding area zoned for forestland or timberland. The Project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland production.

**d) Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?**

**No Impact.** There are no forestlands within the Project site or the surrounding area. The Project would not result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use.

**e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?**

**No Impact.** There are no agricultural resources or forestland within the Project site or surrounding area. Although land to the south within the County of Los Angeles is zoned light agricultural, the land is not currently in agricultural use or production. Further, according to the California Important Farmland Finder, the land is identified as Other Land and does not important farmland.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, the Project would not result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                |
|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>III AIR QUALITY</b>   |                                |   |                                     |                          |
| Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the Project: |                                |   |                                     |                          |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?                      | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

This section is based in part on the *Air Toxics Health Risk Assessment* (Health Risk Assessment) prepared by De Novo Planning Group, dated January 6, 2021 and included in its entirety in Appendix B, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Data. Additional modeling and emissions data for the air quality analysis is also provided in Appendix B.

### Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

- a) ***Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?***
- b) ***Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Air quality emissions would be generated during operation and construction of the proposed Project. Construction would result in numerous activities that would generate dust. The potential for fine, silty soils in the Project area and typical strong afternoon winds experienced in the Antelope Valley exacerbate the potential for dust, particularly in the summer months. Impacts would be localized and variable. Construction impacts would last for a period of approximately four months. The initial phase of Project construction would involve grading and site preparation activities, followed by paving and building construction. Construction activities that could generate dust and vehicle emissions are primarily related to grading, soil excavation, and other ground-preparation activities. The proposed Project would be required to comply with all applicable AVAQMD rules, including District Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), which requires submission and approval of a Dust Control Plan and associated signage. In addition, the

Project would be required to obtain a District Authority to Construct permit corresponding to the requirements of District Rule 461 – Gasoline Transfer and Dispensing.

According to the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD), a Project would have a significant impact if it would trigger or exceed total emissions in excess of the thresholds identified in Table 1, Project Construction Criteria Pollutant Emissions (tons/year) and Table 2, Project Construction Criteria Pollutant Emissions (pounds/day). Table 1 and Table 2 provide the construction-related emissions modeling results from CalEEMod in tons per year and maximum pounds per day, respectively. It should be noted that all on-site construction equipment would meet Tier 4 emissions standards (as provided by the Project Applicant); therefore, the emissions provided reflect the usage of on-site construction equipment that would adhere to Tier 4 emissions standards. It should also be noted, the emissions results do not include the measures associated with District Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), which requires the Project Applicant to develop a Dust Control Plan. Therefore, the emissions results in Table 1 and Table 2 are conservative compared to actual anticipated construction-related emissions, which would be reduced with compliance with Rule 403.

**Table 1: Project Construction Criteria Pollutant Emissions (tons/year)**

| Emissions Type                      | Project Emissions (tons/year) | AVAQMD Threshold (tons/year) | Exceeds Emissions Threshold? |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| ROG/VOC                             | <0.1                          | 25                           | N                            |
| NO <sub>x</sub>                     | 0.4                           | 25                           | N                            |
| CO                                  | 1.1                           | 100                          | N                            |
| PM <sub>10</sub>                    | 0.1                           | 15                           | N                            |
| PM <sub>2.5</sub>                   | 0.1                           | 12                           | N                            |
| SO <sub>x</sub>                     | <0.1                          | 25                           | N                            |
| <i>Source: CalEEMod, v.2016.3.2</i> |                               |                              |                              |

**Table 2: Project Construction Criteria Pollutant Emissions (pounds/day)**

| Emissions Type               | Project Emissions<br>(maximum pounds/day) | AVAQMD Threshold<br>(pounds/day) | Exceeds Emissions<br>Threshold? |
|------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| ROG/VOC                      | 1.4                                       | 137                              | N                               |
| NO <sub>x</sub>              | 12.9                                      | 137                              | N                               |
| CO                           | 34.6                                      | 548                              | N                               |
| PM <sub>10</sub>             | 12.9                                      | 82                               | N                               |
| PM <sub>2.5</sub>            | 7.1                                       | 65                               | N                               |
| SO <sub>x</sub>              | 0.1                                       | 137                              | N                               |
| Source: CalEEMod, v.2016.3.2 |   |                                  |                                 |

Operational-related emissions would be generated primarily from passenger vehicle and heavy-duty truck travel utilizing the proposed Pilot Travel Center, as well as electricity and other energy usage on-site. Table 3, Project Operational Criteria Pollutant Emissions (tons/year) and Table 4, Project Operational Criteria Pollutant Emissions (maximum pounds/day), provide the operational-related emissions modeling results from CalEEMod in tons per year and maximum pounds per day, respectively.

**Table 3: Project Operational Criteria Pollutant Emissions (tons/year)**

| Emissions Type  | Project Emissions<br>(tons/year) | AVAQMD Threshold<br>(tons/year) | Exceeds Emissions<br>Threshold? |
|---|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Reactive Organic Gases/<br>Volatile Organic Compounds (ROG/VOC) | 0.4                              | 25                              | N                               |
| Nitrogen Oxides (NO <sub>x</sub> )                              | 7.0                              | 25                              | N                               |
| Carbon Monoxide (CO)  | 3.5                              | 100                             | N                               |
| Coarse Particulates (PM <sub>10</sub> )                         | 0.8                              | 15                              | N                               |
| Fine Particulates (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )                          | 0.2                              | 12                              | N                               |
| Sulfur Oxides (SO <sub>x</sub> )                                | <0.1                             | 25                              | N                               |
| Source: CalEEMod, v.2016.3.2                                    |                                  |                                 |                                 |

**Table 4: Project Operational Criteria Pollutant Emissions (maximum pounds/day)**

| Emissions Type  | Project Emissions (pounds/day) | AVAQMD Threshold (pounds/day) | Exceeds Emissions Threshold? |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Reactive Organic Gases/<br>Volatile Organic Compounds (ROG/VOC) | 2.1                            | 137                           | N                            |
| Nitrogen Oxides (NO <sub>x</sub> )                              | 38.0                           | 137                           | N                            |
| Carbon Monoxide (CO)  | 19.6                           | 548                           | N                            |
| Coarse Particulates (PM <sub>10</sub> )                         | 4.7                            | 82                            | N                            |
| Fine Particulates (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )                          | 1.3                            | 65                            | N                            |
| Sulfur Oxides (SO <sub>x</sub> )                                | 0.1                            | 137                           | N                            |
| Source: CalEEMod, v.2016.3.2                                    |                                |                               |                              |

As shown in Tables 3 and 4, the proposed Project would not exceed the applicable AVAQMD thresholds associated with operational emissions. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard and impacts would be less than significant.

**c) *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** For purposes of air quality, sensitive receptors are sectors of the population that can be severely impacted by localized air pollution. Sensitive receptors include children, the elderly, and the infirm. The closest sensitive receptors are residential uses located west and south of the Project site.

Toxic Air Contaminants

A toxic air contaminant (TAC) is defined as an air pollutant that may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or in serious illness, or that may pose a hazard to human health. TACs are usually present in minute quantities in the ambient air. However, their high toxicity or health risk may pose a threat to public health even at very low concentrations. In general, for those TACs that may cause cancer, there is no concentration that does not present some risk. This contrasts with the criteria pollutants for which acceptable levels of exposure can be determined and for which the state and federal governments have set ambient air quality standards.

The proposed Project has the potential to impact nearby sensitive receptors due to the nature of the proposed travel center operations, which provide services and amenities, such as fueling facilities, to passing motorists, including commercial truck operators. Heavy-duty diesel trucks are emitters of diesel particulate matter (DPM), which is emitted from on-site truck vehicle circulation

and idling and off-site mobile travel, as well as from the off-gassing of benzene vapor from various on-site refueling activities. Combined, these sources have the potential to generate substantial TACs on nearby sensitive receptors, including those located nearest to the Project site. The AVAQMD has established maximum thresholds of significance for TACs, which would be significant if they exceed the following thresholds:

- Incremental residential cancer risk of equal to or greater than 10 in one million;
- Incremental workplace cancer risk of equal to or greater than 10 in one million; and,
- Chronic and Acute Hazard Index of equal to or greater than 1.0 (project increment).

Air dispersion modeling was conducted using AERMOD and HARP-2 risk modeling software to determine cancer and non-cancer TAC risks on the nearest residential and workplace receptors. Maximum incremental residential cancer risk was evaluated over a 70-year period; maximum incremental workplace cancer risk was evaluated over a 40-year period. Chronic and acute cancer risks on the nearest sensitive receptors were also modeled.

A rectangular (x-y) coordinate system was used to model receptors. An area within 1,000 meters of the proposed travel center site boundaries was used with receptor spacing of 50 meters, where applicable. Additional receptors were added along or near the nearest sensitive receptors surrounding the travel center site. Additional sensitive receptors were placed along nearby roadways and in-between receptors, to allow for analysis throughout the modelling extent and to allow for a visual representation of dispersion contours. Receptors were also placed along the proposed travel center property line.

Table 5, Summary of Maximum Health Risks, displays the residential and workplace cancer risk, and acute and chronic incidence rate results at nearest receptors; refer to Appendix B, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Data for the detailed health risk assessment. On-site truck idling emissions were modeled via 16 volume sources located throughout the travel center site, where idling would occur (these were grouped together as volume sources). Additionally, on-site mobile sources and off-site mobile sources (along the relevant roadways leading to the Project site) were analyzed. Additional parameters, assumptions, and output selections provided within the modeling is described within the health risk assessment provided in Appendix B.



**Table 5: Summary of Maximum Health Risks**

| Risk Metric  | Maximum Risk<br>(per million persons) | Significance<br>Threshold | Is Threshold<br>Exceeded? |
|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Residential Cancer Risk<br>(70-year exposure)  | 3.16                                  | 10 per million            | No                        |
| Workplace Cancer Risk<br>(40-year exposure)  | 3.55                                  | 10 per million            | No                        |
| Chronic (non-cancer)   | <0.01                                 | Hazard Index $\geq$ 1.0   | No                        |
| Acute (non-cancer)   | 0.06                                  | Hazard Index $\geq$ 1.0   | No                        |
| Sources: AERMOD (Lakes Environmental Software, 2016); and HARP-2 Air Dispersion and Risk Tool<br>Notes: 1the maximum residential cancer risk would be for the residence located approximately 190 feet to the west of the project site.<br>The highest residential cancer risk (70-year exposure) at this location is 3.16 per million persons, as provided within this table. |                                       |                           |                           |

As shown in Table 5, the proposed Project would not exceed the maximum risk values established by the AVAQMD for TACs. All receptor types would be below the applicable AVAQMD significance thresholds.

### Carbon Monoxide Hotspots

Areas of vehicle congestion have the potential to create pockets of CO, called hotspots. These pockets have the potential to exceed the state one-hour standard of 20 parts per million (ppm) or the eight-hour standard of 9 ppm. Because CO is produced in greatest quantities from vehicle combustion and does not readily disperse into the atmosphere, adherence to ambient air quality standards is typically demonstrated through an analysis of localized CO concentrations. Hotspots are typically produced at intersections, where traffic congestion is highest because vehicles queue for longer periods and are subject to reduced speeds.

Under existing and future vehicle emissions rates, a Project would have to increase traffic volumes at a single intersection by more than 44,000 vehicles per hour (or 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal air does not mix such as bridges and tunnels) in order to generate a substantial CO impact. The proposed Project would generate a maximum of approximately 69 AM peak hour trips and 68 PM peak hour trips, which would be significantly less than the volumes cited above. Thus, the proposed Project would not have the potential to substantially increase CO hotspots at intersections in the vicinity of the Project site.

### Conclusion

The construction phase of the Project would be temporary and short-term and the proposed Project would not generate significant concentrations of air emissions during construction.

Maximum incremental residential cancer risk was evaluated over a 70-year period; maximum incremental workplace cancer risk was evaluated over a 40-year period. Chronic and acute cancer risks on the nearest sensitive receptors were also modeled. The proposed travel center would not exceed the maximum risk values established by the AVAQMD for TACs. All receptor types would be below the applicable AVAQMD significance thresholds.

Under existing and future vehicle emissions rates, the Project would have to increase traffic volumes at a single intersection by more than 44,000 vehicles per hour (or 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal air does not mix) in order to generate a substantial CO impact. The proposed Project trip generation would not result in an increase in traffic volumes at an intersection resulting in a significant CO impact.

Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in a significant increased exposure of sensitive receptors to localized concentrations of TACs or create a CO hotspot. The Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and the impact would be less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Responses III(a), III(b), and III(c), above regarding emissions. The proposed Project would not generate objectionable odors that would adversely affect substantial numbers of people. During construction, emissions from construction equipment, such as diesel exhaust, and volatile organic compounds from architectural coatings and paving activities may generate odors. However, these odors would be temporary, are not expected to affect a substantial number of people and would disperse rapidly. Therefore, impacts related to odors associated with potential construction-related activities would be less than significant.

Examples of land uses identified as sources of odors include agriculture (farming and livestock), wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical manufacturing, composting facilities, refineries, landfills, dairies, fiberglass manufacturing, transfer station, painting/coating operations (e.g., auto body shops), asphalt batch plant, and rendering plant. The proposed Project would not contain any of these land uses identified as odor sources. The proposed Project would include truck diesel and gasoline refueling stations. However, fumes from gasoline and diesel refueling stations are unlikely to cause emissions resulting in odors affecting a substantial number of people. The Project would be required to comply with all air quality and hazardous materials storage regulations, which would reduce potential odors from on-site refueling activities. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people and impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                           |
|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>IV BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>   |                                |   |                                     |                                     |
| Would the Project:   |                                |   |                                     |                                     |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nesting sites?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

- a) ***Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.**

Special Status Plants

A records search was completed in February 2021, which revealed that there are 20 special status plant species (federal/state listed, and/or California Native Plant Society [CNPS] List 1B, 2, or 4) documented within the 9-quadrangle region search of the Project site. The records search was generated from the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB). The special status plant species in the 9-quadrangle region are shown in Table 6, Special Status Plant Species.

**Table 6: Special Status Plant Species**

| Common Name            | Latin Name                                 | Protection Status (Fed/CA/CNPS) | Habitat  | Presence Determination |
|------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| alkali mariposa-lily   | <i>Calochortus striatus</i>                | --/--/1B.2                      | Chaparral, chenopod scrub, Mojavean desert scrub, meadows and seeps. Alkaline meadows and ephemeral washes. 70-1600m.  | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| Davidson's bush-mallow | <i>Malacothamnus davidsonii</i>            | --/--/1B.2                      | Coastal scrub, riparian woodland, chaparral, cismontane woodland. Sandy washes. 150-1525 m.  | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| Greata's aster         | <i>Symphotrichum greatae</i>               | --/--/1B.3                      | Chaparral, cismontane woodland, broadleafed upland forest, lower montane coniferous forest, riparian woodland. Mesic canyons. 335-2015 m.  | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| Horn's milk-vech       | <i>Astragalus hornii var. hornii</i>       | --/--/1B.1                      | Meadows and seeps, playas. Lake margins, alkaline sites. 75-350 m.   | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| Lancaster milk-vech    | <i>Astragalus preussii var. laxiflorus</i> | --/--/1B.1                      | Chenopod scrub. Alkaline clay flats or gravelly or sandy washes and along draws in gullied badlands. 700-735 m in California.  | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| lemon lily             | <i>Lilium parryi</i>                       | --/--/1B.2                      | Lower montane coniferous forest, meadows and seeps, riparian forest, upper montane coniferous forest. Wet, mountainous terrain; generally in forested areas; on shady edges of streams, in open boggy meadows & seeps. 625-2930 m. | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| Mason's neststraw      | <i>Stylocline masonii</i>                  | --/--/1B.1                      | Chenopod scrub, pinyon and juniper woodland. Sandy washes. 100-1200 m.   | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| Mt. Gleason paintbrush | <i>Castilleja gleasonii</i>                | --/R/1B.2                       | Lower montane coniferous forest, chaparral, pinyon and juniper woodland. On open flats or slopes in granitic soil. Restricted to the San Gabriel Mountains. 975-1950 m.  | <b>Not Present.</b>    |

Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration  
Pilot Travel Center (Case No. TPM 83189, CUP 21-001, SPR 21-001)  
March 1, 2021  
Page 39

| Common Name             | Latin Name  | Protection Status (Fed/CA/CNPS) | Habitat  | Presence Determination |
|-------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| Palmer's mariposa-lily  | <i>Calochortus palmeri</i> var. <i>palmeri</i>            | --/--/1B.2                      | Meadows and seeps, chaparral, lower montane coniferous forest. Vernal moist places in yellow-pine forest, chaparral. 195-2530 m.   | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| Parry's spineflower     | <i>Chorizanthe parryi</i> var. <i>parryi</i>              | --/--/1B.1                      | Coastal scrub, chaparral, cismontane woodland, valley and foothill grassland. Dry slopes and flats; sometimes at interface of 2 vegetation types, such as chaparral and oak woodland. Dry, sandy soils. 90-1220 m. | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| Peirson's lupine        | <i>Lupinus peirsonii</i>                                  | --/--/1B.3                      | Joshua tree woodland, pinyon and juniper woodland, lower montane coniferous forest, upper montane coniferous forest. Decomposed granite slide and talus, on slopes and ridges. 1400-2380 m.                        | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| Peirson's spring beauty | <i>Claytonia peirsonii</i> ssp. <i>Peirsonii</i>          | --/--/1B.2                      | Upper montane coniferous forest, subalpine coniferous forest. Granitic scree slopes, often with a sandy or fine soil component and granitic cobbles. 1510-2745 m.  | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| Robbins' nemacladus     | <i>Nemacladus secundiflorus</i> var. <i>robbinsii</i>     | --/--/1B.2                      | Chaparral, valley and foothill grassland. Dry, sandy or gravelly slopes. Openings. 360-1710 m.   | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| Rosamond eriastrum      | <i>Eriastrum rosamondense</i>                             | --/--/1B.1                      | Chenopod scrub, vernal pools. Alkali pool beds separated by very low hummocks with open cheopod scrub. Often sandy soil. 700-720 m.  | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| sagebrush loeflingia    | <i>Loeflingia squarrosa</i> var. <i>artemisiarum</i>      | --/--/2B.2                      | Great Basin scrub, Sonoran desert scrub, desert dunes. Sandy flats and dunes. Sandy areas around clay slicks w/Sarcobatus, Atriplex, Tetradymia, etc. 700-1615 m.  | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| San Gabriel linanthus   | <i>Linanthus concinnus</i>                                | --/--/1B.2                      | Lower montane coniferous forest, upper montane coniferous forest, chaparral. Dry rocky slopes, often in Jeffrey pine/canyon oak forest. 1310-2560 m.   | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| San Gabriel manzanita   | <i>Arctostaphylos glandulosa</i> ssp. <i>Gabrielensis</i> | --/--/1B.2                      | Chaparral. Rocky outcrops; can be dominant shrub where it occurs. 960-2015 m.  | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| short-joint beavertail  | <i>Opuntia basilaris</i> var. <i>brachyclada</i>          | --/--/1B.2                      | Chaparral, Joshua tree woodland, Mojavean desert scrub, pinyon and   | <b>Not Present.</b>    |

| Common Name  | Latin Name | Protection Status (Fed/CA/CNPS) | Habitat  | Presence Determination |
|--|------------|---------------------------------|--|------------------------|
|  |            |                                 | juniper woodland. Sandy soil or coarse, granitic loam. 425-2015 m. |                        |
| Source: CNDDDB, 2021.<br>Notes: CNPS = CALIFORNIA NATIVE PLANT SOCIETY<br>FEDERAL<br>E = ENDANGERED UNDER THE FEDERAL ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.<br>T = THREATENED UNDER THE FEDERAL ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.<br>STATE<br>E = ENDANGERED UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.<br>T = THREATENED UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.<br>R = RARE UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT<br>CNPS<br>1B = RARE, THREATENED, OR ENDANGERED IN CALIFORNIA AND ELSEWHERE.<br>2 = RARE, THREATENED, OR ENDANGERED IN CALIFORNIA, BUT MORE COMMON ELSEWHERE.<br>.1 = SERIOUSLY ENDANGERED IN CALIFORNIA (OVER 80% OF OCCURRENCES THREATENED-HIGH DEGREE AND IMMEDIACY OF THREAT).<br>.2 = FAIRLY ENDANGERED IN CALIFORNIA (20-80% OCCURRENCES THREATENED).<br>.3= NOT VERY ENDANGERED IN CALIFORNIA (<20% OF OCCURRENCES THREATENED) |            |                                 |  |                        |

Additionally, on September 22, 2020, the California Fish and Game Commission approved the petition to accept the candidacy proposal for the western Joshua tree (*Yucca brevifolia*), effective October 9, 2020. When a plant or wildlife species is granted candidacy under the State's Endangered Species Act, the species is given the same protection as a threatened or endangered species while the Commission evaluates whether formal listing as "threatened" or "endangered" under the California Endangered Species Act is warranted. As such, western Joshua tree is also a protected plant species within the 9-quadrangle region. Western Joshua tree are also protected by PMC Chapter 14.04, which was recently amended to include new and more stringent protections for the western Joshua tree.

The Project site is comprised of an existing swap meet use with buildings/structures associated with the swap meet operations located within the eastern portion of the site and parking located within the western portion of the site. There is a small wooden outpost structure and signage located adjacent to the parking area and Pearblossom Highway. Trees are distributed throughout the Project site and trees/bushes are located along the property boundary adjacent to Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 and a portion of the property boundary adjacent to Pearblossom Highway. There are several driveways/entrances providing access to the Project site from Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 and Pearblossom Highway. All of the driveways currently have moveable barrier gates.

The Project site is entirely graded and developed with buildings/structures associated with the swap meet operations and gravel parking areas. The parking lot includes paved areas along

Pearblossom Highway entryways along the southern boundary of the site, gravel areas in the parking areas throughout the site, and ornamental trees planted in rows to shade the parking area. There are no Joshua trees located within or immediately adjacent to the Project site. The Project site lacks any native vegetation or habitat. The habitat is considered barren habitat, and plant development is inhibited by the gravel base, frequent vehicular travel, and weed abatement.

Google Earth imagery of the site show that the site has been disturbed since at least 2006. Parking on the eastern portion of the site has occurred since 2006. By 2009, the entire Project site appears to be used as a gravel parking area. By 2011, the majority of the site contained parking areas associated with the adjacent developed lot east of the site. The Project site has remained in its current condition since 2015.

As shown in Table 6, the Project site does not provide suitable habitat for any of the special status plant species documented within the 9-quadrangle region search of the Project site. The Project site is devoid of sensitive habitat and does not contain any special status plants that are documented in the region. Therefore, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impacts on special status plants.

Special Status Animals

A records search reveals that there are 33 special status animal species (federal/state listed) within the 9-quadrangle region search of the Project site. The records search came from the CNDDDB. The special status animal species in the 9-quadrangle region are shown in Table 7, Special Status Animal Species.

**Table 7: Special Status Animal Species**

| Common Name         | Latin Name                        | Protection Status (Fed/CA) | Habitat   | Presence Determination      |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| arroyo toad         | <i>Anaxyrus californicus</i>      | E/--                       | Semi-arid regions near washes or intermittent streams, including valley-foothill and desert riparian, desert wash, etc. Rivers with sandy banks, willows, cottonwoods, and sycamores; loose, gravelly areas of streams in drier parts of range. | <b>Not Present.</b>         |
| Bell's sage sparrow | <i>Artemisiospiza belli belli</i> | --/--                      | Nests in chaparral dominated by fairly dense stands of chamise. Found in coastal sage scrub in south of range. Nest located on the ground beneath a shrub or in a shrub 6-18 inches above ground. Territories about 50 yds apart.               | <b>Not Present.</b>         |
| burrowing owl       | <i>Athene cunicularia</i>         | --/--                      | Open, dry annual or perennial grasslands, deserts, and scrublands   | <b>Potentially Present.</b> |

Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration  
Pilot Travel Center (Case No. TPM 83189, CUP 21-001, SPR 21-001)  
March 1, 2021  
Page 42

| Common Name                | Latin Name                          | Protection Status (Fed/CA) | Habitat   | Presence Determination |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|------------------------|
|                            |                                     |                            | characterized by low-growing vegetation. Subterranean nester, dependent upon burrowing mammals, most notably, the California ground squirrel.   |                        |
| California glossy snake    | <i>Arizona elegans occidentalis</i> | --/--                      | Patchily distributed from the eastern portion of San Francisco Bay, southern San Joaquin Valley, and the Coast, Transverse, and Peninsular ranges, south to Baja California. Generalist reported from a range of scrub and grassland habitats, often with loose or sandy soils.   | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| California legless lizard  | <i>Anniella spp.</i>                | --/--                      | Contra Costa County south to San Diego, within a variety of open habitats. This element represents California records of <i>Anniella</i> not yet assigned to new species within the <i>Anniella pulchra</i> complex. Variety of habitats; generally in moist, loose soil. They prefer soils with a high moisture content. | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| California red-legged frog | <i>Rana draytonii</i>               | T/--                       | Lowlands and foothills in or near permanent sources of deep water with dense, shrubby or emergent riparian vegetation. Requires 11-20 weeks of permanent water for larval development. Must have access to estivation habitat.  | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| coast homed lizard         | <i>Phrynosoma blainvillii</i>       | --/--                      | Frequents a wide variety of habitats, most common in lowlands along sandy washes with scattered low bushes. Open areas for sunning, bushes for cover, patches of loose soil for burial, and abundant supply of ants and other insects.  | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| Cooper's hawk              | <i>Accipiter cooperii</i>           | --/--                      | Woodland, chiefly of open, interrupted or marginal type. Nest sites mainly in riparian growths of deciduous trees, as in canyon bottoms on river flood-plains; also, live oaks.   | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| Crotch bumble bee          | <i>Bombus crotchii</i>              | --/CE                      | Coastal California east to the Sierra-Cascade crest and south into Mexico. Food plant genera include  | <b>Not Present.</b>    |



Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration  
Pilot Travel Center (Case No. TPM 83189, CUP 21-001, SPR 21-001)  
March 1, 2021  
Page 43

| Common Name            | Latin Name                         | Protection Status (Fed/CA) | Habitat  | Presence Determination |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|------------------------|
|                        |                                    |                            | Antirrhinum, Phacelia, Clarkia, Dendromecon, Eschscholzia, and Eriogonum.  |                        |
| ferruginous hawk       | <i>Buteo regalis</i>               | --/--                      | Open grasslands, sagebrush flats, desert scrub, low foothills and fringes of pinyon and juniper habitats. Eats mostly lagomorphs, ground squirrels, and mice. Population trends may follow lagomorph population cycles.                          | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| golden eagle           | <i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>           | --/--                      | Rolling foothills, mountain areas, sage-juniper flats, and desert. Cliff-walled canyons provide nesting habitat in most parts of range; also, large trees in open areas.   | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| Le Conte's thrasher    | <i>Toxostoma lecontei</i>          | --/--                      | Desert resident; primarily of open desert wash, desert scrub, alkali desert scrub, and desert succulent scrub habitats. Commonly nests in a dense, spiny shrub or densely branched cactus in desert wash habitat, usually 2-8 feet above ground. | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| least Bell's vireo     | <i>Vireo bellii pusillus</i>       | E/E                        | Summer resident of Southern California in low riparian in vicinity of water or in dry river bottoms; below 2000 ft. Nests placed along margins of bushes or on twigs projecting into pathways, usually willow, Baccharis, mesquite.              | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| loggerhead shrike      | <i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>         | --/--                      | Broken woodlands, savannah, pinyon-juniper, Joshua tree, and riparian woodlands, desert oases, scrub & washes. Prefers open country for hunting, with perches for scanning, and fairly dense shrubs and brush for nesting.                       | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| merlin                 | <i>Falco columbarius</i>           | --/--                      | Seacoast, tidal estuaries, open woodlands, savannahs, edges of grasslands & deserts, farms & ranches. Clumps of trees or windbreaks are required for roosting in open country.   | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| Mohave ground squirrel | <i>Xerospermophilus mohavensis</i> | --/T                       | Open desert scrub, alkali scrub & Joshua tree woodland. Also feeds in annual grasslands. Restricted to   | <b>Not Present.</b>    |

Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration  
Pilot Travel Center (Case No. TPM 83189, CUP 21-001, SPR 21-001)  
March 1, 2021  
Page 44

| Common Name                        | Latin Name                         | Protection Status (Fed/CA) | Habitat   | Presence Determination |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|------------------------|
|                                    |                                    |                            | Mojave Desert. Prefers sandy to gravelly soils, avoids rocky areas. Uses burrows at base of shrubs for cover. Nests are in burrows.   |                        |
| mountain plover                    | <i>Charadrius montanus</i>         | --/--                      | Short grasslands, freshly plowed fields, newly sprouting grain fields, & sometimes sod farms. Short vegetation, bare ground, and flat topography. Prefers grazed areas and areas with burrowing rodents.  | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| Northern California legless lizard | <i>Anniella pulchra</i>            | --/--                      | Sandy or loose loamy soils under sparse vegetation. Soil moisture is essential. They prefer soils with a high moisture content.   | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| pallid bat                         | <i>Antrozous pallidus</i>          | --/--                      | Deserts, grasslands, shrublands, woodlands and forests. Most common in open, dry habitats with rocky areas for roosting. Roosts must protect bats from high temperatures. Very sensitive to disturbance of roosting sites.                                    | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| pallid San Diego pocket mouse      | <i>Chaetodipus fallax pallidus</i> | --/--                      | Desert border areas in eastern San Diego County in desert wash, desert scrub, desert succulent scrub, pinyon-juniper, etc. Sandy, herbaceous areas, usually in association with rocks or coarse gravel.   | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| prairie falcon                     | <i>Falco mexicanus</i>             | --/--                      | Inhabits dry, open terrain, either level or hilly. Breeding sites located on cliffs. Forages far afield, even to marshlands and ocean shores.   | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| quino checkerspot butterfly        | <i>Euphydryas editha quino</i>     | E/--                       | Sunny openings within chaparral & coastal sage shrublands in parts of Riverside & San Diego counties. Hills and mesas near the coast. Need high densities of food plants <i>Plantago erecta</i> , <i>P. insularis</i> , and <i>Orthocarpus purpurescens</i> . | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| San Joaquin pocket mouse           | <i>Perognathus inornatus</i>       | --/--                      | Grassland, oak savanna and arid scrubland in the southern Sacramento Valley, Salinas Valley, San Joaquin Valley and adjacent foothills, south to the Mojave Desert. Associated with fine-textured, sandy, friable soils.                                      | <b>Not Present.</b>    |

Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration  
Pilot Travel Center (Case No. TPM 83189, CUP 21-001, SPR 21-001)  
March 1, 2021  
Page 45

| Common Name                                | Latin Name                          | Protection Status (Fed/CA) | Habitat   | Presence Determination      |
|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Santa Ana sucker                           | <i>Catostomus santaanae</i>         | T/--                       | Endemic to Los Angeles Basin south coastal streams. Habitat generalists, but prefer sand-rubble-boulder bottoms, cool, clear water, and algae.  | <b>Not Present.</b>         |
| southern California rufous-crowned sparrow | <i>Aimophila ruficeps canescens</i> | --/--                      | Resident in Southern California coastal sage scrub and sparse mixed chaparral. Frequents relatively steep, often rocky hillsides with grass and forb patches.   | <b>Not Present.</b>         |
| southern mountain yellow-legged frog       | <i>Rana muscosa</i>                 | E/E                        | Federal listing refers to populations in the San Gabriel, San Jacinto and San Bernardino mountains (southern DPS). Northern DPS was determined to warrant listing as endangered, Apr 2014, effective Jun 30, 2014. Always encountered within a few feet of water. Tadpoles may require 2 - 4 yrs to complete their aquatic development. | <b>Not Present.</b>         |
| Swainson's hawk                            | <i>Buteo swainsoni</i>              | --/T                       | Breeds in grasslands with scattered trees, juniper-sage flats, riparian areas, savannahs, & agricultural or ranch lands with groves or lines of trees. Requires adjacent suitable foraging areas such as grasslands, or alfalfa or grain fields supporting rodent populations.  | <b>Potentially Present.</b> |
| Townsend's big-eared bat                   | <i>Corynorhinus townsendii</i>      | --/--                      | Throughout California in a wide variety of habitats. Most common in mesic sites. Roosts in the open, hanging from walls and ceilings. Roosting sites limiting. Extremely sensitive to human disturbance.  | <b>Not Present.</b>         |
| tricolored blackbird                       | <i>Agelaius tricolor</i>            | --/T                       | Highly colonial species, most numerous in Central Valley & vicinity. Largely endemic to California. Requires open water, protected nesting substrate, and foraging area with insect prey within a few km of the colony.   | <b>Not Present.</b>         |
| two-striped gartersnake                    | <i>Thamnophis hammondi</i>          | --/--                      | Coastal California from vicinity of Salinas to northwest Baja California. From sea to about 7,000 ft elevation. Highly aquatic, found in or near permanent fresh water. Often along   | <b>Not Present.</b>         |

| Common Name   | Latin Name                                | Protection Status (Fed/CA) | Habitat  | Presence Determination |
|---|---|----------------------------|--|------------------------|
|   |   |                            | streams with rocky beds and riparian growth.   |                        |
| unarmored threespine stickleback  | <i>Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoni</i> | E/E                        | Weedy pools, backwaters, and among emergent vegetation at the stream edge in small Southern California streams. Cool (<24 C), clear water with abundant vegetation.  | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| western pond turtle   | <i>Emys marmorata</i>                     | --/--                      | A thoroughly aquatic turtle of ponds, marshes, rivers, streams and irrigation ditches, usually with aquatic vegetation, below 6000 ft elevation. Needs basking sites and suitable (sandy banks or grassy open fields) upland habitat up to 0.5 km from water for egg-laying. | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| Yuma myotis   | <i>Myotis yumanensis</i>                  | --/--                      | Optimal habitats are open forests and woodlands with sources of water over which to feed. Distribution is closely tied to bodies of water. Maternity colonies in caves, mines, buildings or crevices.  | <b>Not Present.</b>    |
| Source: CNDDB, 2021.<br>Notes:<br>FEDERAL<br>E = ENDANGERED UNDER THE FEDERAL ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.<br>T = THREATENED UNDER THE FEDERAL ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.<br>STATE<br>E = ENDANGERED UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.<br>T = THREATENED UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.<br>R = RARE UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.<br>CE = CANDIDATE ENDANGERED UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT. |   |                            |  |                        |

Wildlife observations within gravel parking lots are generally considered very limited due to the lack of habitat and frequency of vehicular activity. The Project site lacks the quality habitat necessary for any of the special status animals documented within the 9-quad search. The following special status animal species have been documented within two miles of the Project site:

- coast horned lizard (*Phrynosoma blainvillii*)
- Northern California legless lizard (*Anniella pulchra*)
- burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*)

The coast horned lizard inhabits open areas of sandy soil and low vegetation in valleys, foothills, and semiarid mountains. They are found in grasslands, coniferous forests, woodlands, and chaparral, with open areas and patches of loose soil, and often in lowlands along sandy washes with scattered shrubs. They can be found along dirt roads and often near ant hills feeding on ants. The habitat needs of this species do not exist on the Project site, and this species is deemed absent.

The Northern California legless lizard occurs in moist warm loose soil with plant cover. Moisture is essential and they occur in sparsely vegetated areas of beach dunes, chaparral, pine-oak woodlands, desert scrub, sandy washes, and stream terraces with sycamores, cottonwoods, or oaks. Leaf litter under trees and bushes in sunny areas and dunes stabilized with bush lupine and mock heather often indicate suitable habitat. They can often be found under surface objects such as rocks, boards, driftwood, and logs. They can also be found by gently raking leaf litter under bushes and trees. Sometimes they are found in suburban gardens in Southern California. The habitat needs of this species do not exist on the Project site, and this species is deemed absent.

Burrowing owl inhabits open grassland, prairies, farmland, as well as some more developed areas such as golf courses, airfields, industrial parks, vacant lots, and other open areas. They favor areas of flat open ground with very short grass or bare soil. Ground squirrel activity will generally coincide with burrowing owl presence, although ground squirrels alone do not indicate presence. This species is a ground nester that can be found nesting along the fringes of disturbed areas such as the Project site; however, this species is not documented onsite and has not been observed. While there is not any current presence, and the current site conditions make nesting highly unlikely, each nesting cycle (year) brings new potential for nesting. Out of an abundance of caution, preconstruction surveys of burrowing owl are required by Mitigation Measure BIO-1.

The ornamental shade trees planted in rows throughout the parking lot are not of the size that is appropriate for raptor nesting. These smaller trees, however, could provide nesting opportunities for a variety of migratory bird nesting. As noted above, each nesting cycle (year) brings new potential for nesting. Any delay in construction into a future year would present a new potential for impacts to nesting birds. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2 would ensure that the Project site is evaluated prior to the commencement of construction if it were to occur during the nesting season. Additionally, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 provides certain protections for nesting birds if they were found during the preconstruction survey.

Given the absence of observations, or appropriate habitat for, special status animals, and with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on special status animals.

- b) ***Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project site is comprised of an existing swap meet use with buildings/structures associated with the swap meet operations located within the eastern portion of the site and primarily gravel parking areas located within the western portion of the site. The Project site does not contain any riparian habitats, or other sensitive natural community known in the region. No blue line streams are documented on the USGS Quadrangle for the Project site or surrounding area. No ephemeral washes were observed within the Project site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c) ***Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Proposed Project consists of a gravel parking lot, and does not contain any riparian habitats, or other sensitive natural community known in the region. There were no blue line streams documented on the USGS Quadrangle for the Project site. No ephemeral washes were observed within the Project site.

Although no known blue line streams or ephemeral washes are located in the Project area, the Project would require the extension of the existing box culvert located under Pearblossom Highway. As part of extending the culvert for the roadway widening, the Project proposes a drainage channel, which would convey water from the outfall of the existing culvert to the northwest corner of the Project site per the historical drainage pattern. All runoff from the proposed travel center site would be directed to the proposed bioretention pond located within the northern portion of the proposed travel center site via sheet flow and underground via catch basin capture points. The proposed travel center site would be hydraulically isolated from the rest of the drainage areas. It is expected that the total discharge to the northwest corner of the property boundary would be reduced to that of existing conditions.

Nevertheless, in the event that the proposed culvert does impact waters of the U.S., the proper regulatory permits would be obtained. Mitigation Measure BIO-3 would require the Applicant to receive the proper determinations and permits should a jurisdictional feature be disturbed. Therefore, the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a state or federally protected wetland and impacts would be less than significant.

- d) ***Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nesting sites?***

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** Many species of birds and their active nests are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). As previously discussed in Section IV(a), the Project site provides some limited nesting habitat in the ornamental shade trees, as well as ground nesting opportunities along the fringe of the parking lot. In order to reduce potential impacts to nesting birds, the Project would be required to comply with Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, which would ensure protection of any birds and active nests and reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

- e) ***Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?***

**No Impact.** PMC Chapter 14.04, *Joshua Tree and Native Desert Vegetation Preservation*, outlines the protection of desert vegetation, which is defined as, “Joshua trees and California juniper as defined by this chapter, and other living plants identified pursuant to the California Desert Native Plants Act.” As discussed above, the California Fish and Game Commission approved the petition to accept the candidacy proposal for the western Joshua tree (*Yucca brevifolia*), effective October 9, 2020, which provides the Joshua tree with the same protection as a threatened or endangered species while the Commission evaluates whether formal listing as “threatened” or “endangered” under the California Endangered Species Act is warranted. As a result, the City amended PMC Chapter 14.04 to include new and more stringent protections for the western Joshua tree. There are no Joshua trees or other desert vegetation located on-site. The Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources; no impact would occur.

- f) ***Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project site is within the boundaries of the West Mojave Plan (habitat conservation plan) (Bureau of Land Management 2005). However, while the Project site is located within the geographic range of special species of concern, state listed, and federal listed species, none are expected to occur within the Project site due to the mostly barren composition of the Project site (high level of disturbance and lack of thriving habitats). The Project site is surrounded by urban development to the east and west, high volume roadways to the north and south, is not located within a Significant Ecological Area or Regional Habitat Linkages for Los Angeles County (Department of Regional Planning 2014), and would not interfere with the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved plan and impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

- BIO-1:** The Project proponent shall implement the following measure to avoid or minimize impacts on western burrowing owl:

No greater than 14 days before initiating ground disturbance activities, the Project proponent shall complete an initial take avoidance survey using the recommended methods described in the Detection Surveys section of the March 7, 2012, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW 2012). The survey shall determine whether on-site burrows which are suitable for burrowing owl are present, and if owls are present on-site. Implementation of avoidance and minimization measures (as presented in the March 7, 2012, CDFW Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation) shall be triggered if the initial take avoidance survey results in positive owl presence on the Project site where Project activities shall occur. If needed, the development of avoidance and minimization approaches shall be developed in coordination with CDFW and fully implemented prior to the start of construction activity.

- BIO-2:** The Project proponent shall implement the following measure to avoid or minimize impacts on special-status birds:

Prior to any permit issuance for grubbing, grading, tree trimming/removal or prior to engaging in such activities that would occur between the breeding season for native birds (February 15 through July 31), the Project proponent shall retain the services of a qualified ornithologist to conduct an ornithological survey of the construction zone. The project proponent shall submit to the City a copy of the executed contract for such services prior to the issuance of any grading permits. The ornithological survey shall occur not more than seven days prior to the initiation of those grading/construction activities. If the ornithologist detects any occupied nests of native birds within the construction zone or in close proximity to, they shall be mapped on construction plans and the project proponent shall fence off the area(s) supporting bird nests with temporary construction fencing, providing a minimum buffer of 200 feet between the nest and limits of construction. (This buffer zone shall be at least 500 feet for raptors until the young have fledged, are no longer being fed by the parents, have left the nest, and will no longer be impacted by the Project.) The construction crew shall be instructed to avoid any activities in the zone until the bird nest(s) is/are no longer occupied, per a subsequent survey by the qualified ornithologist. As an alternative to conducting ornithological surveys during the breeding season and avoiding occupied nests, if detected, the project proponent shall consult as appropriate with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to discuss the potential loss of nests of native birds covered by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) to obtain the appropriate permit from the USFWS.



**BIO-3:** Prior to any construction activities that may disturb a jurisdictional feature, the Project applicant shall obtain a jurisdictional determination from the USACE and CDFW. Authorization for fill from the regulatory agencies (USACE-404 permit, RWQCB-401 certification, 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement) will be necessary and a permit shall be adhered to throughout the construction phase. The Project applicant shall replace on a “no net loss” basis (minimum 1:1 ratio) (in accordance with USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW) the acreage and function of all wetlands and other waters that would be removed, lost, or degraded as a result of Project implementation or operations. Wetland habitat shall be replaced at acreage and location agreeable to the USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW and as determined during the Section 401, 404, and 1600 permitting processes. Habitat restoration, rehabilitation, and/or replacement shall be at a location and by methods agreeable to the agencies.

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact                           |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>V CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>   |                                |   |                              |                                     |
| Would the Project:  |                                |   |                              |                                     |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to in §15064.5?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 and 21084.1, and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, respectively? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                       | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) Disturb any Native American tribal cultural resources or human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                       | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

This section is based on the *Cultural Resources Survey for the Palmdale Pilot Travel Center Project, Palmdale, Los Angeles County, California* (Cultural Resources Survey), prepared by Anza Resource Consultants, dated January 2021, and referenced as Appendix C, Cultural Resources Study (Confidential). The report contains sensitive and confidential information that is not available for public distribution. The report is available for review by professional archaeologists and other qualified individuals at the City of Palmdale Community Development Department.

### Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

**a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to in §15064.5?**

**No Impact.** CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 defines “historic resources” as resources listed in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), or determined to be eligible by the California Historical Resources Commission for listing in the CRHR. The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) recognizes properties that are significant at the national, State and local levels. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, a site or structure may be considered a historical resource if it is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(j), or if it meets the criteria for listing in either the NRHP or the CRHR (14 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] § 4850). CEQA allows local historic resource guidelines to serve as the CRHR criteria if enacted by local legislation to act as the equivalent of the State criteria.

Historical resources are defined as buildings, structures, objects, sites, and districts of significance in history, archaeology, architecture, and culture. These resources include intact

structures of any type that are 50 years or more of age. These resources are sometimes called the “built environment” and can include, in addition to houses, other structures such as irrigation works and engineering features. Historical resources are preserved because they provide a link to a region’s past as well as a frame of reference for a community.

A search of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) was performed at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) to identify previous cultural resources studies and previously recorded cultural resources within a one-mile radius of the Project site. The CHRIS search included a review of the NRHP, the CRHR, the California Points of Historical Interest List, the California Historical Landmarks list, the Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility list, and the California State Historic Resources Inventory list. The records search also included a review of all available historic USGS 7.5-, 15-, and 30-minute quadrangle maps. A survey of the Project site was also conducted.

No cultural resources of historic origin were observed within the Project boundaries during the field survey conducted on May 16, 2020. Results of the records search indicated at least 15 cultural resources studies have been conducted within a 0.5-mile radius of the Project site. However, none of these included the Project site, and none of the studies resulted in the identification or recordation of historic or prehistoric sites within the search radius or Project boundaries.

Six historic built environment resources were identified within 0.5 mile of the Project site. None of these resources are within the Project site.

As no historic or potentially historic built environment resources are located within the Project site or surrounding area, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5 and no impact would occur.

**b) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 and 21084.1, and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, respectively?***

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** As discussed above, at least 15 cultural resources studies have been conducted within a 0.5-mile radius of the Project site. However, none of these included the Project site, and none of the studies resulted in the identification or recordation of historic or prehistoric sites within the search radius or Project boundaries. Further, no cultural resources of historic origin were observed within the Project boundaries during the field survey.

As part of preparation of the Cultural Resources Study, a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search was requested from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on April 27, 2020. On May 6, 2020, the NAHC responded that the search of the SLF was completed with negative results (i.e., no sacred lands or resources important to Native Americans are recorded within the vicinity of the

Project site). The NAHC provided a list of eight Native American contacts that may have additional knowledge regarding Native American cultural resources within or near the Project site. Letters were mailed to each of the Native American contacts describing the Project and requesting if they had knowledge regarding cultural resources of Native American origin within or near the Project site. The Quechan Indian Tribe responded in a letter delivered via email on June 1, 2020, stating they have no comments regarding the Project and defer to local tribes. The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (SMBMI) responded via email on June 12, 2020, stating that the proposed Project area exists within Serrano ancestral territory and is of interest to SMBMI. However, they added, “project location look[s] to show a great deal of disturbance and, as such, SMBMI will unlikely have concerns with the Project during consultation with the Lead Agency.” In compliance with Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), the City provided formal notification to those California Native American Tribal representatives requesting notification in accordance with AB 52; refer to Section XVIII Tribal Cultural Resources. The SMBMI and Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians (FTBMI) responded requesting consultation and incorporation of mitigation measures in the event cultural resources are discovered during project activities, including the requirement for SMBMI and FTBMI to be notified in the event of a discovery and the proper handling of resources if avoidance cannot be ensured; refer to Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2.

Based on the assessment conducted as part of the Cultural Resources Report, the archaeological sensitivity of the Project site is considered low. However, while highly unlikely, there is the potential for accidental discovery of archaeological resources during ground-disturbing activities, which could result in potential impacts. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 would require work in the immediate area to be halted if cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities and an archaeologist to be contacted to evaluate the find. Additionally, the SMBMI and FTBMI would be contacted so the Tribes can provide input with regards to significance and treatment of the find. With implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 and CUL-2, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and impacts would be less than significant.

**c) *Disturb any Native American tribal cultural resources or human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?***

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** There are no dedicated cemeteries within the Project site or surrounding area. Most Native American human remains are found in association with prehistoric archaeological sites. As discussed above, there are no known archaeological resources within the Project site and the potential for archaeological resources is considered low. However, there is the potential for previously unknown human remains to be discovered/disturbed during the Project’s ground disturbing activities, resulting in a potentially significant impact.

If human remains are found, the remains would require proper treatment in accordance with applicable laws, including State of California Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5-7055 and

Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and Section 5097.99. Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5-7055 describe the general provisions for treatment of human remains. Specifically, Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 prescribes the requirements for the treatment of any human remains that are accidentally discovered during excavation of a site. Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 also requires that all activities cease immediately, and a qualified archaeologist and Native American monitor be contacted immediately. As required by State law, the procedures set forth in Public Resources Code Section 5087.98 would be implemented, including evaluation by the County Coroner and notification of the NAHC. The NAHC would designate the “Most Likely Descendent” of the unearthed human remains. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3 would ensure that if human remains are found during excavation, excavation would be halted near the find until the County Coroner has investigated, and appropriate recommendations have been made for treatment and disposition of the remains. Following compliance with Mitigation Measure CUL-3, the Project’s potential impacts concerning human remains would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

- CUL-1:** In the event that cultural resources are discovered during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) shall cease and a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall be hired to assess the find. Work on the other portions of the project outside of the buffered area may continue during this assessment period. Additionally, the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI) and Fernandeano Tataviam Band of Mission Indians (FTBMI) shall be contacted, as detailed within TCR-1, regarding any pre-contact and/or post-contact historic-era finds and be provided information after the archaeologist makes his/her initial assessment of the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment.
- CUL-2:** If significant pre-contact and/or post-contact historic-era cultural resources, as defined by CEQA (as amended), are discovered and avoidance cannot be ensured, the archaeologist shall develop a Monitoring and Treatment Plan, the drafts of which shall be provided to SMBMI and FTBMI for review and comment, as detailed within TCR-1. The archaeologist shall monitor the remainder of the project and implement the Plan accordingly.
- CUL-3:** If human remains or funerary objects are encountered during any activities associated with the project, work in the immediate vicinity (within a 100-foot buffer of the find) shall cease and the County Coroner shall be contacted pursuant to State Health and Safety Code §7050.5 and that code enforced for the duration of the project.

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>VI ENERGY</b>  |                                |   |                                     |                          |
| Would the Project:  |                                |   |                                     |                          |
| a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

- a) ***Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?***
- b) ***Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines requires consideration of the potentially significant energy implications of a project. CEQA requires mitigation measures to reduce “wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary” energy usage (Public Resources Code Section 21100, subdivision [b][3]). According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the means to achieve the goal of conserving energy include decreasing overall energy consumption, decreasing reliance on natural gas and oil, and increasing reliance on renewable energy sources. In particular, the proposed Project would be considered “wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary” if it were to violate state and federal energy standards and/or result in significant adverse impacts related to project energy requirements, energy inefficiencies, energy intensiveness of materials, cause significant impacts on local and regional energy supplies or generate requirements for additional capacity, fail to comply with existing energy standards, otherwise result in significant adverse impacts on energy resources, or conflict or create an inconsistency with applicable plan, policy, or regulation.

The Project proposes the construction of a travel center, which would include fueling facilities, travel amenities, restaurants, and parking facilities for passing motorists and commercial truck operators. The amount of energy used at the Project site would directly correlate to the energy consumption (including fuel) used by vehicle trips generated during Project construction, fuel used by off-road construction vehicles during construction, fuel used by vehicles during operation of the travel center, and electricity and other energy usage during operation.

The proposed Project would be in compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations regulating energy usage. For example, statewide measures, including those intended to improve the energy efficiency of the statewide passenger and heavy-duty truck vehicle fleet (e.g., the Pavley Bill and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard) are improving vehicle fuel economies, thereby conserving gasoline and diesel fuel. These energy savings would continue to accrue over time. Additionally, the proposed travel center would be required to comply with Title 24 requirements, which require energy efficiency measures in the design and operation of buildings.

As a result, the proposed Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to Project energy requirements, energy use inefficiencies, and/or the energy intensiveness of materials by amount and fuel type for each stage of the Project including construction, operations, maintenance, and/or removal. The proposed Project would comply with all existing energy standards, including those established by the City of Palmdale and Los Angeles County, and would not result in significant adverse impacts on energy resources or obstruct any plans for energy efficiency, including the Palmdale Energy Action Plan. Therefore, the proposed Project would not be expected to cause an inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary use of energy resources nor cause a significant impact on any of the threshold as described by Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. This is a less than significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>VII GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</b> Would the Project:   |                                |   |                                     |                          |
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?       | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Modeling and emissions data for the greenhouse gas emissions analysis is provided in [Appendix B, Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Data](#).

Various gases in the Earth's atmosphere, classified as atmospheric greenhouse gases (GHGs), play a critical role in determining the Earth's surface temperature. Solar radiation enters Earth's atmosphere from space, and a portion of the radiation is absorbed by the Earth's surface. The Earth emits this radiation back toward space, but the properties of the radiation change from high-frequency solar radiation to lower-frequency infrared radiation.

Naturally occurring GHGs include water vapor (H<sub>2</sub>O), carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), and ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). Several classes of halogenated substances that contain fluorine, chlorine, or bromine are also GHGs, but they are, for the most part, solely a product of industrial activities. Although the direct GHGs, including CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O, occur naturally in the atmosphere, human activities have changed their atmospheric concentrations. From the pre-industrial era (i.e., ending about 1750) to 2011, concentrations of these three GHGs have increased globally by 40, 150, and 20 percent, respectively (IPCC, 2013).

Greenhouse gases, which are transparent to solar radiation, are effective in absorbing infrared radiation. As a result, this radiation that otherwise would have escaped back into space is now retained, resulting in a warming of the atmosphere. This phenomenon is known as the greenhouse effect. Among the prominent GHGs contributing to the greenhouse effect are carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), water vapor, nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), and chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs).

Emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change are attributable in large part to human activities associated with the industrial/manufacturing, utility, transportation, residential, and agricultural sectors. In California, the transportation sector is the largest emitter of GHGs, followed by the industrial sector (California Energy Commission, 2020).

As the name implies, global climate change is a global problem. GHGs are global pollutants, unlike criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants, which are pollutants of regional and local



concern, respectively. California produced 424 million gross metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (MMTCO<sub>2e</sub>) in 2019 (California Energy Commission, 2019). Given that the U.S. EPA estimates that worldwide emissions from human activities totaled nearly 46 billion gross metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (BMTCO<sub>2e</sub>) in 2010, California's incremental contribution to global GHGs is approximately 2 percent (U.S. EPA, 2014).

Carbon dioxide equivalents are a measurement used to account for the fact that different GHGs have different potential to retain infrared radiation in the atmosphere and contribute to the greenhouse effect. This potential, known as the global warming potential of a GHG, is also dependent on the lifetime, or persistence, of the gas molecule in the atmosphere. Expressing GHG emissions in carbon dioxide equivalents takes the contribution of all GHG emissions to the greenhouse effect and converts them to a single unit equivalent to the effect that would occur if only CO<sub>2</sub> were being emitted.

Consumption of fossil fuels in the transportation sector was the single largest source of California's GHG emissions in 2014, accounting for 41 percent of total GHG emissions in the state. This category was followed by the industrial sector (24%), the electricity generation sector (including both in-state and out-of-state sources) (15%) and the agriculture sector (8%) (California Energy Commission, 2016).

## **Regulatory Framework**

### U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Endangerment Finding

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) authority to regulate GHG emissions stems from the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Massachusetts v. EPA* (2007). The Supreme Court ruled that GHGs meet the definition of air pollutants under the existing Clean Air Act and must be regulated if these gases could be reasonably anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. Responding to the Court's ruling, the EPA finalized an endangerment finding in December 2009. Based on scientific evidence it found that six GHGs (CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, hydrofluorocarbons [HFCs], perfluorocarbons [PFCs], and sulfur hexafluoride [SF<sub>6</sub>]) constitute a threat to public health and welfare. Thus, it is the Supreme Court's interpretation of the existing Clean Air Act and the EPA's assessment of the scientific evidence that form the basis for the EPA's regulatory actions.

### Assembly Bill 32 (California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006)

California passed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32; California Health and Safety Code Division 25.5, Sections 38500-38599). AB 32 establishes regulatory, reporting, and market mechanisms to achieve quantifiable reductions in GHG emissions and establishes a cap on Statewide GHG emissions. AB 32 requires that Statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. AB 32 specifies that regulations adopted in response to Assembly Bill (AB) 1493 (Pavley Bill) should be used to address GHG emissions from vehicles. However, AB 32 also includes language stating that if the AB 1493 regulations cannot be implemented, then the California Air Resources Board (CARB) should develop new regulations to control vehicle GHG emissions under the authorization of AB 32.

#### Senate Bill 375

Senate Bill (SB) 375, signed in September 2008 (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008), aligns regional transportation planning efforts, regional GHG reduction targets, and land use and housing allocations. SB 375 requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to adopt a sustainable communities' strategy (SCS) or alternative planning strategy (APS) that will prescribe land use allocation in that MPOs regional transportation plan. CARB, in consultation with MPOs, is required to provide each affected region with GHG reduction targets emitted by passenger cars and light trucks in the region for the years 2020 and 2035. These reduction targets are to be updated every eight years but can be updated every four years if advancements in emissions technologies affect the reduction strategies to achieve the targets. CARB is also charged with reviewing each MPO's SCS or APS for consistency with its assigned targets. If MPOs do not meet the GHG reduction targets, transportation projects may not be eligible for funding.

#### Executive Order S-3-05

Executive Order S-3-05 set forth a series of target dates by which Statewide emissions of GHGs would be progressively reduced, as follows:

- By 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels;
- By 2020, reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels; and
- By 2050, reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels.

The Executive Order directed the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) Secretary to coordinate a multi-agency effort to reduce GHG emissions to the target levels. The Secretary is required to submit biannual reports to the Governor and California Legislature describing the progress made toward the emissions targets, the impacts of global climate change on California's resources, and mitigation and adaptation plans to combat these impacts. To comply with Executive Order S-3-05, the Cal/EPA Secretary created the California Climate Action Team, made up of members from various State agencies and commissions. The Climate Action Team released its first report in March 2006, which proposed to achieve the targets by building on the voluntary actions of California businesses, local governments, and communities and through State incentive and regulatory programs.

#### Title 24, Part 6

The California Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) and commonly referred to as "Title 24" were established in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California's energy consumption. Part 6 of Title 24 requires the design of building shells and building components to conserve energy. The standards are updated periodically to allow consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods. The 2019 Title 24 standards took effect on January 1, 2020. Under 2019 Title 24 standards, residential buildings will use about 53 percent less energy, mainly due to solar photovoltaic panels and lighting upgrades, when compared to those constructed under 2016 Title 24 standards.

#### Title 24, Part 11

The California Green Building Standards Code (CCR Title 24, Part 11), commonly referred to as CALGreen, is a Statewide mandatory construction code developed and adopted by the California Building Standards Commission and the Department of Housing and Community Development. CALGreen also provides voluntary tiers and measures that local governments may adopt that encourage or require additional measures in five green building topical areas. The most recent update to the CALGreen Code went into effect on January 1, 2020.

#### Senate Bill 3

Signed into law on September 2016, SB 32 codifies the 2030 GHG reduction target in Executive Order B-30-15 (40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030). SB 32 authorizes CARB to adopt an interim GHG emissions level target to be achieved by 2030. CARB also must adopt rules and regulations in an open public process to achieve the maximum, technologically feasible, and cost-effective GHG reductions.

#### CARB Scoping Plan

On December 11, 2008, CARB adopted its Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan), which functions as a roadmap to achieve GHG reductions in California required by AB 32 through subsequently enacted regulations. The Scoping Plan contains the main strategies California will implement to reduce CO<sub>2</sub>eq emissions by 174 million metric tons (MT), or approximately 30 percent, from the State's projected 2020 emissions levels of 596 million MTCO<sub>2</sub>eq under a business as usual (BAU) scenario. This is a reduction of 42 million MTCO<sub>2</sub>eq, or almost ten percent, from 2002 to 2004 average emissions, and requires the reductions in the face of population and economic growth through 2020.

The Scoping Plan calculates 2020 BAU emissions as the emissions that would be expected to occur in the absence of any GHG reduction measures. The 2020 BAU emissions estimate was derived by projecting emissions from a past baseline year using growth factors specific to each of the different economic sectors (e.g., transportation, electrical power, industrial, commercial, and residential). CARB used three-year average emissions, by sector, from 2002 to 2004 to forecast emissions to 2020. The measures described in the Scoping Plan are intended to reduce projected 2020 BAU emissions to 1990 levels, as required by AB 32.

AB 32 requires CARB to update the Scoping Plan at least once every five years. CARB adopted the first major update to the Scoping Plan on May 22, 2014. The 2014 Scoping Plan summarizes recent science related to climate change, including anticipated impacts to California and the levels of GHG reduction necessary to likely avoid risking irreparable damage. It identifies the actions California has already taken to reduce GHG emissions and focuses on areas where further reductions could be achieved to help meet the 2020 target established by AB 32. The 2014 Scoping Plan also looks beyond 2020 toward the 2050 goal, established in Executive Order S-3-05, and observes that "a mid-term statewide emission limit will ensure that the State stays on course to meet our long-term goal." The 2014 Scoping Plan did not establish or propose any specific post-2020 goals, but identified such goals adopted by other governments or

recommended by various scientific and policy organizations.

In December 2017, CARB approved the California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan: The Strategy for Achieving California's 2030 Greenhouse Gas Target (2017 Scoping Plan). This update focused on implementation of a 40-percent reduction in GHGs by 2030 compared to 1990 levels. To achieve this, the 2017 Scoping Plan draws on a decade of successful programs that addresses the major sources of climate changing gases in every sector of the economy:

- **More Clean Cars and Trucks:** The 2017 Scoping Plan establishes far-reaching programs to incentivize the sale of zero-emission vehicles, drive the deployment of zero-emission trucks, and shift to a cleaner system of handling freight Statewide.
- **Increased Renewable Energy:** California's electric utilities are ahead of schedule in meeting the requirement that 33 percent of electricity come from renewable sources by 2020. The 2017 Scoping Plan guides utility providers to 50 percent renewables, as required under SB 350.
- **Slashing Super-Pollutants:** The 2017 Scoping Plan calls for a significant cut in super-pollutants, such as CH<sub>4</sub> and HFC refrigerants, which are responsible for as much as 40 percent of global warming.
- **Cleaner Industry and Electricity:** California's renewed cap-and-trade program extends the declining cap on emissions from utilities and industries and the carbon allowance auctions. The auctions will continue to fund investments in clean energy and efficiency, particularly in disadvantaged communities.
- **Cleaner Fuels:** The Low Carbon Fuel Standard will drive further development of cleaner, renewable transportation fuels to replace fossil fuels.
- **Smart Community Planning:** Local communities will continue developing plans which will further link transportation and housing policies to create sustainable communities.
- **Improved Agriculture and Forests:** The 2017 Scoping Plan also outlines innovative programs to account for and reduce emissions from agriculture, as well as forests and other natural lands.

#### **Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

- a) ***Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?***
- b) ***Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project would generate GHGs during the construction and operational phases of the proposed Project. The primary source of construction-related GHGs from the Project would result from emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> associated with the construction of the Project, and worker vehicle trips. The Project would require grading, and would also include site preparation, building construction, and paving phases. Sources of GHGs during Project operation

would include CO<sub>2</sub> associated with operational vehicle trips and on-site energy usage (e.g., electricity). Other sources of GHG emissions would be minimal.

Table 8, Project Construction and Operational GHG Emissions (tons/year), provides the estimated annual GHG emissions that would be generated during Project construction and operation and Table 9, Project Construction and Operational GHG Emissions (maximum pounds/day), provides the estimated maximum daily emissions that would be generated during Project construction and operation, compared to the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District's (AVAQMD) annual thresholds.

**Table 8: Project Construction and Operational GHG Emissions (tons/year)**

| Year                | CO <sub>2e</sub> (tons/year) | Significance Threshold (tons/year) | Is Threshold Exceeded? |
|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>Construction</b> |                              |                                    |                        |
| 2021                | 152.5                        | 100,000                            | No                     |
| <b>Operation</b>    |                              |                                    |                        |
| Annual              | 2,045                        | 100,000                            | No                     |

**Table 9: Project Construction and Operational GHG Emissions (maximum pounds/day)**

| Year                | CO <sub>2e</sub> (tons/year) | Significance Threshold (pounds/day) | Is Threshold Exceeded? |
|---------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>Construction</b> |                              |                                     |                        |
| 2021                | 5,949                        | 548,000                             | No                     |
| <b>Operation</b>    |                              |                                     |                        |
| Annual              | 2,045                        | 548,000                             | No                     |

As shown in Table 8 and Table 9, the Project would not exceed the applicable AVAQMD thresholds for GHGs. The proposed Project would not generate GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with any applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases, including the City's Energy Action Plan; impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                           |
|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>VIII GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the Project:  |                                |   |                                     |                                     |
| a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of injury, damage or death involving?  |                                |   |                                     |                                     |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based upon on other substantial evidence of a known fault?              | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| iv) Landslides?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

This section is based in part on the *Geotechnical Evaluation Report* (Geotechnical Investigation), prepared by Geotechnical Solutions, Inc., dated June 17, 2020 and the *Geotechnical Addendum Report* (Geotechnical Addendum) prepared by Geotechnical Solutions, Inc., dated June 17, 2020, included in their entirety as Appendix D, Geotechnical Studies.

## Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

- a) ***Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of injury, damage or death involving:***
- i) ***Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based upon other substantial evidence of a known fault?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act was passed in 1972 to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting to structures for human occupancy. The Act's main purpose is to prevent the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults. The Act requires the State Geologist to establish regulatory zones, known as "Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones," around the surface traces of active faults and to issue appropriate maps. If an active fault is found, a structure for human occupancy cannot be placed over the trace of the fault and must be set back from the fault (typically 50 feet). The nearest fault to the Project site is the San Andreas Fault, located approximately 1.5-miles from the site. According to the Geotechnical Investigation, the Project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies zone for earthquake rupture hazard and the potential for direct surface fault rupture in the Project area is considered very low. Therefore, the proposed Project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects associated with rupture of a known earthquake fault zone. Impacts would be less than significant.

- ii) ***Strong seismic ground shaking?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Geotechnical Investigation indicates the most significant geologic hazard to the Project site is the potential for moderate to strong groundshaking from earthquakes generated on faults in the vicinity of the site. The Project site is located within the highly seismic southern California region, within the influence of several fault systems that are considered to be active or potentially active. The Geologic Investigation concluded that development of the Project, as proposed, is feasible from a geotechnical point of view provided the recommendations presented in the Geologic Investigation are incorporated into the design and construction of the Project. The Geotechnical Investigation includes specific recommendations based on seismic design parameters for foundation design, retaining walls, exterior concrete flatwork, concrete mix design, corrosion, pavement design, and general earthwork and grading, among other factors. Further, design of the proposed structures in accordance with the current California Building Code is anticipated to adequately mitigate concerns with ground shaking.

Pursuant to PMC Section 8.04.201, Adoption of building codes, the City has adopted the 2019 California Building Standards Code (CBSC), subject to certain amendments and changes. The Project would be required to comply with all applicable regulations in the most recent CBSC as amended by the PMC, which includes design requirements to mitigate the effects of potential

hazards associated with seismic ground shaking.

The Palmdale Building and Safety Division would review construction plans for compliance with the CBSC and the PMC, as well as the Geotechnical Investigation's recommendations. Thus, compliance with the City's established regulatory framework and standard engineering practices and design criteria, which would be verified through the City's construction plan review process, would ensure potential impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking at the Project site would be reduced to a less than significant level.

**iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Liquefaction is a phenomenon where earthquake-induced ground vibrations increase the pore pressure in saturated, granular soils until it is equal to the confining, overburden pressure. Engineering research of soil liquefaction potential indicates that generally three basic factors must exist concurrently in order for liquefaction to occur. These factors include:

- A source of ground shaking, such as an earthquake, capable of generating soil mass distortions.
- A relatively loose silty and/or sandy soil.
- A relative shallow groundwater table (within approximately 50 feet below ground surface) or completely saturated soil conditions that will allow positive pore pressure generation.

The Project site is not within a zone mapped as requiring evaluation of earthquake-induced liquefaction. As part of the Geotechnical Investigation, liquefaction susceptibility of the onsite soils was evaluated. A sediment is considered to be susceptible to transformation to a fluid mass during a strong seismic event only if the packing of the grains (relative density) is relatively low. Testing of the on-site soils determined medium dense to very dense sand. Groundwater was not encountered within a drilled hole depth 41.5 feet during the field study. The historic groundwater depth was determined to be way deeper than 50 feet below existing ground surface. The nearest well, located approximately 0.15-mile northwest of the Project area indicated the elevation depth to the highest groundwater level was at 2,544 feet above mean sea level. The elevation at the Project site is at 2,755 feet above mean sea level, indicating the groundwater level is approximately 200 feet below the Project site. Thus, the potential for liquefaction at the site is considered to be low due to the dense nature of the soils and depth of groundwater; impacts would be less than significant.

**iv) *Landslides?***

**No Impact.** Landslides are mass movements of the ground that include rock falls, relatively shallow slumping and sliding of soil, and deeper rotational or transitional movement of soil or rock. The Project site and surrounding area do not contain any areas with significant slopes or landforms. Landslides or other forms of natural slope instability do not represent a hazard to the



Project site. Further, the Project site is not within a zone mapped as requiring evaluation of earthquake-induced landsliding potential. As the site is not located near steep slopes, the Geotechnical Investigation determined landsliding associated with the Project site would be unlikely.

**b) *Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** No appreciable artificial fill was encountered at the boring locations during exploratory drilling conducted as part of the Geotechnical Investigation. The upper and underlying natural soils are alluvium, generally fine to coarse grained, medium dense to dense, sand, some gravel, silty and trace clayey. Grading and earthwork activities associated with Project construction would expose soils to potential short-term erosion by wind and water. The Project would be required to comply with City grading standards and prepare a Temporary Erosion Control Plan, signed by a registered civil engineer. In accordance with General Permit Order No. 99-08-DWQ, the Project Applicant would be required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for approval by the City prior to grading. The SWPPP would identify Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would be implemented to prevent erosion, minimize siltation from impacting downstream water bodies, and protecting water quality. Following compliance with the established regulatory framework identified in the PMC regarding stormwater and runoff pollution control, potential impacts associated with soil erosion and the loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

**c) *Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Responses VIII(a)(iii) and VIII(a)(iv) regarding the potential for liquefaction and landslides, respectively.

According to the Geotechnical Investigation, the Project site is in an area of stable soil conditions with low shrink-swell potential. Further, the Geotechnical Investigation notes that the Project would not be subject to geologic hazard from settlement, slippage, or landslide provide the recommendations of the Geotechnical Investigation are incorporated into the proposed construction. The Geotechnical Investigation includes specific recommendations based on seismic design parameters and geologic conditions for foundation design, retaining and screening walls, exterior flatwork, concrete mix design, corrosion, pavement design, and general earthwork and grading, among other factors.

The Project would be required to comply with all applicable regulations in the most recent CBSC as amended by the PMC. The Palmdale Building and Safety Division would review construction plans for compliance with the CBSC and the PMC, as well as the Geotechnical Investigation's recommendations. Thus, compliance with the City's established regulatory framework and standard engineering practices and design criteria, which would be verified through the City's

construction plan review process, would ensure potential impacts associated with a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or would become unstable at the Project site would be reduced to a less than significant level.

**d) *Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?***

**No Impact.** Expansive soils are those that undergo volume changes as moisture content fluctuates, swelling substantially when wet or shrinking when dry. Soil expansion can damage structures by cracking foundations, causing settlement and distorting structural elements. The Geotechnical Investigation indicates the soil beneath the Project site is classified as non-expansive to very low expansive. Thus, the Project would not create a substantial risk to life or property associated with expansive soil.

**e) *Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?***

**No Impact.** The Project does not propose the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Public wastewater service for the Project would be provided by the Palmdale Sewer Maintenance District (PSMD) which owns, maintains, and operates the City's Wastewater Collection System. Therefore, no impact would occur in this regard.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** The Palmdale General Plan (Exhibit ER-8) identifies areas of the City having high, low, and undetermined potential for paleontological resources based on a Paleontological Sensitivity Study that was prepared for the Palmdale area. The Project site is located within an area as having undetermined potential. Areas identified as undetermined or unknown potential may contain Pleistocene alluvium, which is of high potential, but is covered by a thin layer of recent alluvium with an unknown potential for producing paleontological resources. Although located within an area identified as undetermined, it does not preclude the potential for undiscovered resources to be present within the Project site. There is the potential that excavation activities could encounter unique paleontological resources, which could result in potential impacts. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would require work in the immediate area to be halted if paleontological resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities and a qualified paleontologist to be contacted to evaluate the find. With implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1, the Project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site and impacts would be less than significant.

### **Mitigation Measures**

**GEO-1:** In the event paleontological resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate area shall be halted and a qualified paleontologist shall be contacted immediately to evaluate the find. Construction activities shall be temporarily redirected to another location on-site so that the monitor can recover any specimens encountered during excavation. All fossils/specimens collected shall be deposited in a City approved museum repository for curation and storage.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                           |
|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>IX HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> Would the Project:  |                                |   |                                     |                                     |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, emission or disposal of hazardous materials?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or a public use airport, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

This section is based in part on the *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment* (Phase I ESA), prepared by Broadbent & Associates, Inc., dated May 12, 2020 and the *Asbestos Inspection Report* (Asbestos Report), prepared by Broadbent & Associates, Inc., dated August 12, 2020, included in their entirety as Appendix E, Hazardous Materials Studies.

### Regulatory Framework

The transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials are regulated by federal, state, and local laws and regulatory agencies.

### Federal and State

According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), a “hazardous” waste is defined as one “which because of its quantity, concentrations, or physiochemical or infectious properties, may either increase mortality or produce irreversible or incapacitating illness, or pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or the environment when improperly treated, stored, transported, or disposed of, or otherwise managed” (U.S. Public Health and Welfare Code Section 6903). Special handling and management are required for materials and wastes that exhibit hazardous properties. Treatment, storage, transport, and disposal of these materials are highly regulated at both the Federal and State levels. Compliance with Federal and State hazardous materials laws and regulations minimizes the potential risks to the public and the environment presented by these potential hazards, which include the following, among others:

- Resources Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) – hazardous waste management;
- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) – cleanup of contamination;
- Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act (SARA) – cleanup of contamination; and
- Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (HMTA) – safe transport of hazardous materials.

These laws provide the “cradle to grave” regulation of hazardous wastes. Businesses, institutions, and other entities that generate hazardous waste are required to identify and track their hazardous waste from the point of generation until it is recycled, reused, or disposed of. The primary responsibility for implementing RCRA is assigned to the EPA, although individual states are encouraged to seek authorization to implement some or all RCRA provisions.

The EPA and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) have developed and continue to update lists of hazardous wastes subject to regulation. In addition to the EPA and DTSC, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Lahontan Region (Region 6), is the enforcing agency for the protection and restoration of water resources, including remediation of unauthorized releases of hazardous substances in soil and groundwater. Other State agencies involved in hazardous materials management include the Office of Emergency Services, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), California Highway Patrol (CHP), and California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle). California hazardous materials management laws include the following, among others:

- Hazardous Materials Management Act – business plan reporting;
- Hazardous Substance Act – cleanup of contamination;
- Hazardous Waste Control Act – hazardous waste management; and
- Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 – releases of and exposure to carcinogenic chemicals.

### *Department of Toxic Substances Control*

In 1992, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) received authorization from the USEPA to implement the RCRA, Subtitle C requirements and the associated regulations.

Receiving authorization from the USEPA means that DTSC is the primary authority enforcing the RCRA hazardous waste requirements in California. RCRA Subtitle C establishes standards for the generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste in the United States.

The DTSC is also responsible for implementing and enforcing California's own hazardous waste laws, which are known collectively as the Hazardous Waste Control Law. Although similar to RCRA, the California Hazardous Waste Control Law and its associated regulations define hazardous waste more broadly and regulate a larger number of chemicals. Hazardous wastes regulated by California, but not by EPA, are called "non-RCRA hazardous wastes."

#### *Transportation of Hazardous Materials/Waste*

Enacted in 1975, the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (HMTA) is the primary federal law in the United States regulating the transportation of hazardous materials. Its purpose is to protect against the risks to life, property, and the environment that are inherent in the transportation of hazardous material in intrastate, interstate, and foreign commerce. The HMTA defines a hazardous material as a substance or material that, if not regulated, may pose an unreasonable risk to health, safety, or property when transported in commerce, which includes materials that are explosive, flammable, corrosive, infectious or hazardous in other ways. The HMTA sets extensive guidelines for carriers of hazardous materials. They must classify, package, and label materials appropriately, use specific hazardous material placards for shipments, and have suitable shipping papers at all times. They must follow U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) rules, maintain rapid response plans for emergencies, undergo safety training programs, and comply with packaging standards. The law establishes minimum standards of regulation for the transport of hazardous materials by air, ship, rail, and motor vehicle. The HMTA is implemented through various agencies based on the mode of transportation and the type of hazardous material being transported.

Transportation of hazardous materials/wastes is regulated by California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 26. CHP and Caltrans enforce Federal and State regulations and respond to hazardous materials transportation emergencies. Emergency responses are coordinated as necessary between Federal, State, and local governmental authorities and private persons through a State-mandated Emergency Management Plan.

#### *Worker and Workplace Hazardous Materials Safety*

Occupational safety standards exist to minimize worker safety risks from both physical and chemical hazards in the workplace. The California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) is responsible for developing and enforcing workplace safety standards and assuring worker safety in the handling and use of hazardous materials. Among other requirements, Cal/OSHA requires many businesses to prepare Injury and Illness Prevention Plans and Chemical Hygiene Plans. The Hazard Communication Standard requires that workers be informed of the hazards associated with the materials they handle.

## Regional

### *Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board*

The Lahontan RWQCB is the enforcing agency for the protection and restoration of water resources, including remediation of unauthorized releases of hazardous substances in soil and groundwater. The Underground Storage Tank (UST) program protects public health and safety and the environment from releases of petroleum and other hazardous substances from UST systems. The program is administered by the State Water Board and consists of four program elements: leak prevention, cleanup, enforcement, and tank tester licensing. The RWQCB oversees the cleanup element of the UST program.

## Local

### *Los Angeles County Fire Department*

The Los Angeles County Fire Department Health Hazardous Materials Division is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for Palmdale. The HHMD's mission is to protect the public health and the environment throughout Los Angeles County from accidental releases and improper handling, storage, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes through coordinated efforts of inspections, emergency response, enforcement, and site mitigation oversight. The Hazardous Materials Specialists are environmental health professionals dedicated to preventing pollution by serving both the public and business communities in Los Angeles County. HHMD administers the Hazardous Waste Generator Program, the Hazardous Release Response Plans and Inventory Program, the California Accidental Release Prevention Program (Cal-ARP), the Aboveground Storage Tank Program and the Underground Storage Tank Program for Los Angeles County.

### *Palmdale Emergency Operations Plan*

The City of Palmdale Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) addresses the City of Palmdale's planned response and short-term recovery to extraordinary emergency/disaster situations associated with natural disasters, technological incidents, and national security emergencies. The City's EOP establishes the emergency organization, assigns tasks, and specifies policies and general procedures. The EOP is designed to include the City of Palmdale as part of the Los Angeles Operational Area, California Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS), and National Incident Management System (NIMS), which provides a framework for coordinating multi-agency responses in the case of emergencies.

## **Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

- a) ***Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, emission or disposal of hazardous materials?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed Pilot Travel Center would remove the wooden outpost structure and materials associated with the site's use as a parking lot (e.g.,

lighting, landscaping, gravel, etc.). Construction activities would include grading associated with on- and off-site improvements, installation of utilities/infrastructure, roadway improvements, building construction and pavement. Refer to Response IX(b) regarding existing on-site conditions. Generally, the exposure of persons to hazardous materials could occur in the following manners: 1) improper handling or use of hazardous materials or hazardous wastes during construction or operation of future development, particularly by untrained personnel; 2) an accident during transport; 3) environmentally unsound disposal methods; or 4) fire, explosion or other emergencies. The severity of potential effects varies with the activity conducted, the concentration and type of hazardous material or wastes present, and the proximity of sensitive receptors.

Project construction could expose construction workers and the public to temporary hazards related to the transport, use, and maintenance of construction equipment and/or materials (i.e., oil, diesel fuel, and transmission fluids). These activities would be short-term in nature, and the materials used would not be in such quantities or stored in such a manner as to pose a significant safety hazard. The construction contractor would be required to use standard construction controls and safety procedures that would avoid and minimize the potential for hazards associated with the transport and use of hazardous materials. Standard construction practices would be observed such that any materials released are appropriately contained and remediated as required by local, State, and Federal law. Compliance with the applicable laws and regulations governing the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials would ensure that all potentially hazardous materials are used and handled in an appropriate manner. Therefore, impacts concerning the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during Project construction would be less than significant.

The operational phase of the Project would occur after construction is complete and business operations commence, including the presence of employees and customers within the travel center site. The proposed Project would involve typical activities associated with gas and diesel fueling stations, convenience stores, and restaurants, which would include diesel and gasoline fuels to be stored and dispensed on-site and the use of commercially available cleaning products and the occasional use of pesticides and herbicides for landscape maintenance. There is a risk of release of these materials into the environment if they are not stored and handled in accordance with best management practices. Hazardous materials would be required to be stored, used, and disposed of in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. Any business that would handle hazardous material and/or hazardous waste of quantities at any one time during a year equal to, or greater than a total volume of 55 gallons, a total weight of 500 pounds, or 200 cubic feet of a compressed gas is a hazardous materials handler and must report Owner/Operator, Business Activities, Inventory, Site Map, and Emergency Response and Contingency Plan and Employee Training Plan information in the California Environmental Reporting System (CERS). Therefore, the Project would be required to report information in the CERS. Further, the Project would be required to comply with existing regulatory requirements, including but not limited to the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 49, Transportation, specific to the transport of hazardous materials, California Code of Regulations Titles 8, 22, and Title 26, and their enabling legislation



set forth in California Health and Safety Code (HSC) Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory, and the requirements of the CUPA, which would ensure safety standards related to the use and storage of hazardous materials are implemented.

The Project would involve the transport of hazardous materials to the site associated with the proposed travel center's fueling operations. The transport of fuel and tank filling operations would be conducted in compliance with applicable federal and state regulatory requirements that regulate the transportation of hazardous materials. Additionally, trucks utilizing the proposed travel center may also transport hazardous materials. However, the Palmdale General Plan identifies Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 as a State Route open to vehicles carrying hazardous materials/waste. Thus, the transport of hazardous materials/waste within the area occurs under existing conditions. The transport of hazardous materials on area roadways are regulated by the California Highway Patrol and Caltrans. Transporters of hazardous wastes are required to be certified by the DOT and manifests are required to track the hazardous waste during transport.

Consistency with local, state, and federal regulations related to the transport, storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials would ensure that the potential risk associated with the routine transport, use, emission or disposal of hazardous materials would be minimized to the extent practical and impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** One of the means through which human exposure to hazardous substance could occur is through accidental release. Incidents that result in an accidental release of hazardous substance into the environment can cause contamination of soil, surface water, and groundwater, in addition to any toxic fumes that might be generated. Human exposure of contaminated soil, soil vapor, or water can have potential health effects on a variety of factors, including the nature of the contaminant and the degree of exposure. Refer to Response IX(a) regarding proposed on-site conditions.

A Phase I ESA was prepared to identify recognized environmental conditions (RECs), controlled recognized environmental conditions (CRECs), historical recognized environmental conditions (HRECs) and/or de minimis conditions that occur within the proposed travel center site or surrounding area that may impact the site. A REC refers to the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment. A HREC refers to a past release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products that has occurred in connection with the property and has been addressed to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory authority or meeting unrestricted use criteria established by a regulatory authority, without subjecting the

property to any required controls (for example, property use restrictions, activity and use limitations, institutional controls, or engineering controls). A CREC refers to recognized environmental condition resulting from a past release of hazardous substances or petroleum products that has been addressed to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory authority (for example, as evidenced by the issuance of a no further action letter or equivalent, or meeting risk-based criteria established by regulatory authority), with hazardous substances or petroleum products allowed to remain in place subject to the implementation of required controls (for example, property use restrictions, activity and use limitations, institutional controls, or engineering controls). A de minimis Condition refers to a condition that generally does not present a threat to human health or the environment and that generally would not be the subject of an enforcement action if brought to the attention of appropriate governmental agencies. Conditions determined to be de minimis conditions are not recognized environmental conditions nor controlled recognized environmental conditions.

As part of the Phase I ESA a review of the Project site's location, general vicinity characteristics, current uses, description of on-site improvements, and current uses of adjoining properties and an interview of the property owner and review of title records, environmental liens or activity, and use limitations was conducted. No RECs, CRECs and/or HRECs were identified relative to these reviews and interview.

A records review of regulatory databases was also conducted. One property (referenced as Liquor King), located within 0.014-mile of the Project site, was identified on a list of regulatory databases. According to the Phase I ESA, in 2005, upgrades were made to the UST system at the Liquor King facility (currently a Chevron gas station). In accordance with applicable regulations, soil samples were collected from beneath the petroleum fuel dispensers, piping and excavation stockpiles. Low concentrations of total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) were detected in three of eleven soil samples. Based on results of the soil sample analysis, no further action was requested. The no further action request was granted in a letter from the RWQCB on April 22, 2010. Due to the low concentrations of petroleum found in the soil, and since groundwater did not appear to be impacted by this release, it was determined unlikely that this release has had a negative impact on the Project site.

Other sites identified were determined to not pose a significant environmental concern relative to the proposed travel center site due to their distance from or relative location to the site or that some of the sites listed are not indicative of a release, but simply indicate that the site/facility may possess chemicals of concern. Additionally, two historical auto stations listed within a 0.25-mile radius of the Project site were identified. However, no evidence was found to indicate the sites have had a negative impact on the site. Additional review of historical record sources, including topographical maps, aerial photographs, fire insurance maps, city directories did not identify any environmental RECs, CRECs and/or HRECs relative to the Project site. Further, site reconnaissance and interviews did not identify and areas of concern.

An asbestos inspection of the wooden outpost structure located within the proposed travel center site was conducted. The purpose of the inspection was to assess building materials and document the presence of asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) at or above regulatory thresholds. The scope of inspection consisted of a preliminary visual reconnaissance of suspect ACM followed by the collection of representative samples of suspect ACM after designating homogeneous sampling areas (areas in which the materials are uniform in color, texture, construction or application date, and general appearance). Each homogeneous area was observed for material type, location, condition, friability, and estimated volume. Samples were collected using EPA-recommended sampling procedures and a total of nine bulk samples were collected from suspect building materials identified during the inspection. The samples were tested and determined that none of the materials sampled were identified as ACM.

The Phase I ESA did not identify any RECs, CRECs and/or HRECs relative to the proposed travel center site and surrounding area with the potential to impact the site. Further, the Asbestos Report concluded no presence of ACMs associated with the on-site structure. Thus, development of the proposed travel center, as proposed, would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

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

**No Impact.** The Project site is not located within 0.25-mile of a school. The closest school is Buena Vista Elementary School, located approximately 0.55-mile north of the Project site. Thus, implementation of the Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25-mile of a school site. No impacts would occur.

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

**No Impact.** Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the DTSC and SWRCB to compile and update a regulatory sites list (pursuant to the criteria of the Section). The California Department of Health Services is also required to compile and update, as appropriate, a list of all public drinking water wells that contain detectable levels of organic contaminants and that are subject to water analysis pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 116395. Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the local enforcement agency, as designated pursuant to Section 18051 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, to compile, as appropriate, a list of all solid waste disposal facilities from which there is a known migration of hazardous waste.

As part of the Phase I ESA, a search of environmental records was conducted by EDR. The Project site was not identified as being listed on any regulatory databases. Based on review of

the CalEPA Cortese listing, the Project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, the Project site has not been included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and as a result would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

- e) ***For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or a public use airport, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?***

**No Impact.** The Project site is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of a public or public use airport. The closest airport to the Project site is Palmdale Regional Airport and Air Force Plant 42, located approximately 5.5 miles northwest of the Project site.

- f) ***Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Palmdale EOP addresses the City of Palmdale's planned response and short-term recovery to extraordinary emergency/disaster situations associated with natural disasters, technological incidents, and national security emergencies. The City's EOP establishes the emergency organization, assigns tasks, and specifies policies and general procedures. The EOP is designed to include the City of Palmdale as part of the Los Angeles Operational Area, SEMS, and NIMS, which provides a framework for coordinating multi-agency responses in the case of emergencies.

The General Plan Safety Element (Exhibit S-1) identifies major streets designated as evacuation routes. Within the Project area, Pearblossom Highway and 47<sup>th</sup> Street East are designated as evacuation routes. In the event of an emergency, the City would coordinate with the Office of Emergency Services, the Sheriff's Department, and local fire stations in establishing evacuation procedures. Pearblossom Highway would provide primary access to the travel center site and would continue to serve as the primary evacuation and emergency access route within the area. Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 and 47<sup>th</sup> Street East would also provide access to and out of the Project area. The Project proposes to widen Pearblossom Highway along the Project site's frontage to its ultimate half-width right-of-way from the Project site's westerly property line to the proposed travel center's easterly property line, which would also include installation of a traffic signal. During construction activities associated with the proposed on- and off-site improvements, traffic lanes located immediately adjacent to the Project site may be temporarily closed or controlled by construction personnel. However, this would be temporary and emergency access to the Project site and surrounding area would be required to be maintained at all times.

---

<sup>3</sup> Department of Toxic Substances Control, *Cortese List Data Resources*, [Cortese List Data Resources | CalEPA](#), accessed July 30, 2020.

Additionally, all construction staging would occur within the boundaries of the Project site and would not interfere with circulation along Pearblossom Highway, Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138, or any other nearby roadways. Upon completion of the Project, improvements to Pearblossom Highway would provide for upgraded access and traffic flow within the area due to the proposed widening and intersection improvements. Pearblossom would continue to serve as a primary evacuation route within the area.

Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant would be required to submit appropriate plans for plan review to ensure compliance with zoning, building, and fire codes. The Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) would review the Project for access requirements, minimum roadway widths, fire apparatus access roads, fire lanes, signage, access walkways, among other requirements to ensure adequate emergency access would be provided to and within the Project site. The Project would be required to comply with all applicable Building and Fire Code requirements and would submit construction plans to the Fire Department's Engineering Building Plan Check Unit for review and approval prior to issuance of any building permit. Approval by the Fire Department would ensure that construction and operation of the proposed travel center would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the City's EOP or emergency evacuation plan and impacts would be less than significant.

**g) *Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The General Plan Safety Element (Exhibit S-58) does not identify the Project site or surrounding area as being located within a wildfire hazard zone. Further, Fire Hazard Severity Zone maps produced by CalFire do not identify the Project site or surrounding area as being located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ).<sup>4</sup> CalFire identifies the area to the south of the Project site and Pearblossom Highway, within unincorporated Los Angeles County, as having moderate fire hazard potential.<sup>5</sup> Thus, the Project site and surrounding area are not identified as having a significant risk associated with wildland fires. As stated, the Project would be required to comply with all zoning, building, and fire codes and would be reviewed by the LACFD to ensure compliance. The proposed Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires and impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

---

<sup>4</sup> CalFire, *Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA*, [Map of CAL FIRE's Fire Hazard Severity Zones in Local Responsibility Areas – Palmdale](#), accessed July 30, 2020.

<sup>5</sup> CalFire, *Fire Hazard Severity Zones in SRA*, Adopted by CalFire on November 7, 2007, [Map of CAL FIRE's Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Areas – Los Angeles County](#), accessed July 30, 2020.

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                           |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>X HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b>  |                                |   |                                     |                                     |
| Would the Project:  |                                |   |                                     |                                     |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?                                 | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course or a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would: |                                |   |                                     |                                     |
| i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or                            | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| iv) impede or redirect flood flows?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

This section is based in part on the *Geotechnical Engineering Percolation/Infiltration Test Report* (Percolation Report), prepared by Geotechnical Solutions, Inc., dated June 17, 2020 and included in its entirety as Appendix D, Geotechnical Studies and the *Preliminary Hydrology & Hydraulics Report* (Preliminary Hydrology Report), prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., dated January 2021 and included in its entirety as Appendix I, Preliminary Hydrology Report.

## **Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

- a) ***Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?***

### **Less Than Significant Impact.**

#### Short-Term Construction

Short-term construction activities associated with the proposed Project could impact water quality. Sources of potential construction-related storm water pollution include handling, storage, and disposal of construction materials containing pollutants; maintenance and operation of construction equipment; and site preparation activities, such as excavation, grading and trenching. These sources, if not controlled, can generate soil erosion and on- and off-site transport via storm run-off or mechanical equipment. Poorly maintained vehicles and heavy equipment leaking fuel, oil, antifreeze, or other vehicle-related fluids on the Project site are also common sources of storm water pollution and soil contamination.

Discharge of pollutants into waters of the United States are regulated by the SWRCB. Potential construction-related water quality impacts would be addressed through compliance with PMC Chapter 8.04, *Adoption of Health, Safety and Technical Construction Codes*, which establishes the regulations for control of excavation, grading, and earthwork construction for the control of grading site runoff, including erosion, sediments and construction related pollutants, and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program's Construction General Permit. Construction activity subject to this General Permit includes any construction or demolition activity, including, but not limited to, clearing, grading, grubbing, or excavation, or any other activity that results in a land disturbance of equal to or greater than 1.0 acre. As the proposed Project construction activities would disturb more than 1.0 acre, it would be subject to the General Permit. To obtain coverage under the General Permit, dischargers are required to file with the SWRCB the Permit Registration Documents (PRDs), which include a Notice of Intent (NOI) and other compliance-related documents.

The Project Applicant would be required to prepare and submit a NOI and a SWPPP to the SWRCB demonstrating compliance with the General Permit. The General Permit requires that non-storm water discharges from construction sites be eliminated or reduced to the maximum extent practicable, that a SWPPP be developed governing construction activities for the proposed Project, and that routine inspections be performed of all storm water pollution prevention measures and control practices being used at the site, including inspections before and after storm events. The SWPPP is required to specify Best Management Practices (BMPs) that the Project would be required to implement during construction activities to ensure that all potential pollutants of concern are prevented, minimized, and/or otherwise appropriately treated prior to being discharged from the Project site. Examples of BMPs that may be used during construction include, but are not limited to, sandbag barriers, geotextiles, storm drain inlet protection, sediment

traps, rip rap soil stabilizers, and hydroseeding. Upon completion of the Project, the Applicant would be required to submit a Notice of Termination to the SWRCB to indicate that construction is completed. Mandatory compliance with the PMC and SWPPP would ensure that the proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during construction activities. Therefore, water quality impacts associated with construction activities would be less than significant.

### Long-Term Operations

Proposed Project operations could result in long-term impacts to surface water quality from urban stormwater runoff. The proposed Project would result in new impervious areas associated with site improvements, including new asphalt, fueling facilities, and the proposed travel center building. Typical activities at the proposed travel center site would include the use of various automotive petroleum products (i.e., oil, grease, fuel) and common cooking materials. Diesel fuel exhaust from diesel trucks and associated truck refrigeration units (TRUs) would also cause air pollution that could affect water quality. Human activities have an effect on water quality when chemicals, heavy metals, hydrocarbons (auto emissions and car crank case oil), and other materials are transported with stormwater into drainage systems.

The proposed on-site bioretention system would provide water quality functions for on-site stormwater runoff. As described in Response X(c), all runoff from the proposed travel center site would be directed to a proposed bioretention pond via sheet flow and underground via catch basin capture points. The catch basins and the concrete spillways at the retention pond would receive oil water separator inserts as a form of pretreatment for water quality. The proposed on-site stormwater drainage facilities and water quality measures would ensure the proposed Project would not impact water quality. As part of the permit review and approval process, the City of Palmdale Engineering Division would review the proposed drainage improvements and water quality measures to ensure the proposed measures would comply with the City storm drain and water quality requirements. The proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality; impacts would be less than significant.

- b) ***Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Response XIX(b) for a discussion concerning the Project's water supplies/demand, including groundwater.

Field investigations, including borings, were conducted as part of the Percolation Report prepared for the Project. Groundwater was not encountered at a depth of 40 feet below grade in the borings. The historical high groundwater level (California Geological Survey) was identified as deeper than 50 feet below the ground surface. Review of available groundwater well maps data as part of the



Percolation Report also identified historical high groundwater levels as much deeper than 50 feet. The Project proposes to infiltrate stormwater runoff from the proposed travel center site. As discussed in Response X(c), runoff from the proposed travel center site would be directed to a proposed bioretention pond via sheet flow and underground via catch basin capture points. The proposed bioretention pond would allow for infiltration of stormwater into the groundwater aquifer. Stormwater from the adjacent areas to the east and north of the proposed travel center site would continue to flow in a similar pattern as existing conditions and would confluence with the discharge from the drainage channel and continue to discharge to the northwest corner of the parent parcel. Thus, the Project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge and impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Response X(a) regarding potential impacts involving erosion and water quality.

The Project would not alter the course of a stream or river, as there are no streams or rivers located within or around the Project site. The Project site consists of one drainage area. Under existing conditions, the drainage area sheet flows in the northwest direction until reaching the northwest corner of the Project site. One offsite drainage area consisting of approximately 1,380 acres south of Pearblossom Highway flows in a northerly direction toward Pearblossom Highway. This area is primarily undeveloped land with some small low-density residential areas. Runoff from this area is collected via a six-foot by two-foot double reinforced concrete box (RCB) on the southwest corner of Pearblossom Highway and 53<sup>rd</sup> Street East and discharges onto the Project site. Once on the Project site, the runoff continues to flow in the northwesterly direction until it reaches the northwest corner of the Project site. Currently, the total discharge produced from the Project site and the offsite drainage area collect at the northwest corner of the Project site where it eventually overtops the property boundary and enters a retention pond that was constructed as part of the residential development located west of the Project site.

The proposed Pearblossom Highway roadway widening would require the extension of the existing box culvert located under Pearblossom Highway. As part of extending the culvert for the roadway widening, the Project proposes a drainage channel, which would convey water from the outfall of the existing culvert to the northwest corner of the Project site per the historical drainage pattern. The diversion channel and outlet would be designed so that runoff rates are reduced to that of existing conditions. Stormwater from the adjacent areas to the east and north of the proposed travel center site would continue to flow in a similar pattern as existing conditions and would confluence with the discharge from the drainage channel and continue to discharge to the northwest corner of the parent parcel.

All runoff from the proposed travel center site would be directed to the proposed bioretention pond located within the northern portion of the proposed travel center site via sheet flow and underground via catch basin capture points. The catch basins and the concrete spillways at the pond would receive oil water separator inserts as a form of pretreatment for water quality. The proposed bioretention system would be designed to fully infiltrate the 0.75-inch storm event to meet Los Angeles County Low Impact Requirements. Additionally, the bioretention system would be sized to retain and infiltrate the volume differential between the existing and proposed runoff for the 50-year storm event. Runoff exceeding the bioretention pond design would overflow via a control outlet structure, which would limit the travel center site discharge to that of existing conditions and ultimately flow northwest follow existing drainage patterns. The proposed travel center site would be hydraulically isolated from the rest of the drainage areas. It is expected that the total discharge to the northwest corner of the property boundary would be reduced to that of existing conditions.

As discussed above, the proposed drainage channel would convey water from the outfall of the existing culvert to the northwest corner of the parent parcel, consistent with historical drainage patterns. Similarly, stormwater from the adjacent areas to the east and north of the proposed travel center site would continue to flow in a similar pattern as existing conditions and continue to discharge to the northwest corner of the parent parcel. Additionally, the travel center site's proposed storm drain system would capture runoff generated as a result of the site's proposed condition. Thus, the Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site resulting in an increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding, create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of the existing drainage system, or impede or redirect flood flows. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

**No Impact.** According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the Project site is located within Zone X, defined as areas determined to be outside the 0.2 percent annual chance floodplain.<sup>6</sup> Thus, the Project site is not located within a

---

<sup>6</sup> Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Insurance Rate Map, Map Number 06037C0700F, Effective Date

flood hazard area. Tsunamis are sea waves that are generated in response to large-magnitude earthquakes, which can result in coastal flooding. Seiches are the oscillation of large bodies of standing water, such as lakes, that can occur in response to ground shaking. The Project site is located within the high desert of Los Angeles County, approximately 45 miles from the Pacific Ocean. Further, there are no large bodies of standing water near the Project site; Una Lake and Lake Palmdale are located approximately 4.25 miles to the west. As a result, tsunamis and seiches do not pose hazards due to the Project site's inland location and lack of nearby bodies of standing water. The Project site is not located within a flood hazard, tsunami or seiche zones potentially resulting in a release of pollutants due to Project Inundation. No impact would occur in this regard.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Responses X(a) and X(b), above. In addition to complying with the SWPPP during Project construction activities, the Project proposes on-site drainage improvements that include water quality measures to ensure the proposed travel center operations would not impact water quality. As discussed above, all runoff from the proposed travel center site would be directed to the proposed bioretention pond via sheet flow and underground via catch basin capture points. The catch basins and the concrete spillways at the pond would receive oil water separator inserts as a form of pretreatment for water quality. The bioretention pond would provide for infiltration of stormwater into the groundwater aquifer. Thus, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan; impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                           |
|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>XI LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the Project:  |                                |   |                                     |                                     |
| a) Physically divide an established community?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

**a) *Physically divide an established community?***

**No Impact.** The approximately 28-acre Project site is comprised of an existing swap meet use with buildings/structures associated with the swap meet operations located within the eastern portion of the site and parking located within the western portion of the site. The entire 28-acre parcel is designated Regional Commercial (RC) by the City of Palmdale General Plan and is zoned C-4 (Commercial Center) by the City of Palmdale Zoning Map. The Project proposes to a TPM to subdivide the existing 28-acre parcel into three parcels. The approximately 9-acre western parcel is proposed to be developed with a Pilot Travel Center. The Project site would retain the existing RC land use designation and C-4 zoning.

Although development occurs within the surrounding area, the Project site is physically separated from uses to the north by a berm and elevated railroad track and to the south by Pearblossom Highway. The Project site is also physically separated by the residential subdivision to the west by three parcels (two undeveloped and one containing a Palmdale Water District facility) that are located immediately to the west of the Project site. The Project site is designated for commercial uses and development of a portion of the Project site with the proposed travel center would be consistent with the land uses located east of the Project site and at the corner of Pearblossom Highway and Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138. The Project proposes a shared roadway/driveway that would extend north from Pearblossom Highway along the eastern edge of the travel center site, providing access to the Project site. Additionally, an access easement is proposed from the travel center site to the parcel to the west. Development of the roadway/driveway and the proposed access easement would not physically divide an established community, as it would provide shared access to the adjacent parcels. No impact would occur in this regard.

- b) ***Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project site is designated Regional Commercial (RC) by the City of Palmdale General Plan. The RC designation is designed to accommodate retail and service uses attracting consumers from a regional market area. Regional commercial uses should be accessible via major arterial streets or freeways. The Project proposes the construction and operation of a Pilot Travel Center on an approximately 9-acre portion of the Project site for regional and local highway traveling users. Implementation of the Project would involve the development of fueling facilities, travel amenities, restaurants, and parking facilities for passing motorists and commercial truck operators. The proposed Project would be consistent with the City's General Plan land use designation and no amendments to the General Plan would be required. Thus, the proposed Project would not conflict with the City's General Plan and impacts would be less than significant.

The Project site is zoned C-4 (Commercial Center) by the City of Palmdale Zoning Map. The Commercial Center (C-4) Zone is intended to create and preserve certain commercial areas for development as regional retail centers. Typical uses in this zone would include a regional mall, major retail outlets, office complexes, hotels and convention facilities, entertainment centers, and supportive commercial and service uses. According to PMC, Chapter 17.54, *Commercial Center (C-4)*, development in the C-4 zone is required to be processed in accordance with a master plan, which may take the form of a CUP. PMC Chapter 17.22, *Conditional Use Permits*, establishes the purpose of a CUP, which is to allow certain uses that contribute to the orderly growth and development of the City to be properly integrated into the surroundings in which they are to be located. Additionally, a CUP is required for the alcoholic beverage license in accordance with PMC Section 17.92.070. The CUP process is intended to ensure that all site development regulations and performance standards are provided in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance. In addition, the CUP ensures ongoing compliance with conditions of operation which may be applied to the use in order to protect public health, safety and welfare, and to ensure compliance with the General Plan goals, objectives and policies. Approval of the CUP is required to be based on minimum criteria and requires findings be made by the approval authority. The Project would be consistent with the C-4 zoning, subject to approval of a CUP. PMC Chapter 17.54, Section 17.54.100, *Standards of Development*, establishes the development standards for the C-4 zone, including but not limited to, lot area and width, building setbacks, height, and coverage, parking, signs, and landscaping. The Project would comply with the development standards required for the C-4 zone.

As discussed, the Project would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation and with approval of the CUP, it would be consistent with the zoning for the Project site. Further, the Project would be consistent with the development standards for the C-4 zone,

and as demonstrated throughout this Initial Study would not result in significant unavoidable environmental impacts. Thus, the proposed Project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact                           |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>XII MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the Project:  |                                |   |                              |                                     |
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?                                | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

- a) ***Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?***
- b) ***Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?***

**No Impact.** The State Mining and Geology Board (SMGB) establishes Mineral Resources Zones (MRZs) to designate lands that contain mineral deposits. The PMC Chapter 17.72, *Quarry and Reclamation (Zone QR)*, is established to preserve areas of the City designated by the State of California as Significant Mineral Resource Areas, or which possess market grade mineral resource in order to ensure long-term availability of these sites for the extraction and processing of rock, sand, gravel, and similar materials. The Project site is zoned C-4 (Commercial Center) and is not identified as a site having significant mineral resources by the Palmdale General Plan. The Project site does not contain any mining or recovery operations for mineral resources, nor have these operations historically occurred on the Project site. Development of the Pilot Travel Center, as proposed, would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the state or result in the loss of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. No impact would occur in this regard.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                           |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>XIII NOISE.</b> Would the Project:   |                                |   |                                     |                                     |
| a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

This section is based in part on the *Pilot Travel Palmdale Development Project Noise Impact Study* (Noise Study) prepared by MD Acoustics, dated January 2021 and included in its entirety as Appendix F, Noise Study.

### Fundamentals of Noise

#### Sound, Noise, Acoustics

Sound is a disturbance created by a moving or vibrating source and is capable of being detected by the hearing organs. Sound may be thought of as mechanical energy of a moving object transmitted by pressure waves through a medium to a human ear. For traffic, or stationary noise, the medium of concern is air. Noise is defined as sound that is loud, unpleasant, unexpected, or unwanted.

#### Frequency and Hertz

A continuous sound is described by its frequency (pitch) and its amplitude (loudness). Frequency relates to the number of pressure oscillations per second. Low-frequency sounds are low in pitch (bass sounding) and high-frequency sounds are high in pitch (squeak). These oscillations per second (cycles) are commonly referred to as Hertz (Hz). The human ear can hear from the bass pitch starting out at 20 Hz all the way to the high pitch of 20,000 Hz.

#### Sound Pressure Levels and Decibels

The amplitude of a sound determines its loudness. The loudness of sound increases or decreases as the amplitude increases or decreases. Sound pressure amplitude is measured in units of micro-Newton per square inch meter (N/m<sup>2</sup>), also called micro-Pascal (μPa). One μPa is



approximately one hundred billionths (0.0000000001) of normal atmospheric pressure. Sound pressure level (SPL or Lp) is used to describe in logarithmic units the ratio of actual sound pressures to a reference pressure squared. These units are called decibels abbreviated dB.

#### Addition of Decibels

Because decibels are on a logarithmic scale, sound pressure levels cannot be added or subtracted by simple plus or minus addition. When two sounds of equal SPL are combined, they will produce an SPL three dB greater than the original single SPL. In other words, sound energy must be doubled to produce a three dB increase. If two sounds differ by approximately 10 dB, the higher sound level is the predominant sound.

#### Noise Sensitive Land Uses

As defined in the City of Palmdale General Plan Noise Element, "Noise-sensitive land uses", referred to herein as sensitive receptors, include residential (single and multi-family dwellings, mobile home parks, dormitories, and similar uses); transient lodging (including hotels, motels, and similar uses); hospitals, nursing homes, convalescent hospitals, and other facilities for long-term medical care; public or private educational facilities, libraries, churches, and places of public assembly. The proposed project is considered to be a "less-than sensitive" receptor. Some consideration of noise impact may be appropriate.

#### Human Response to Changes in Noise Levels

In general, the healthy human ear is most sensitive to sounds between 1,000 Hz and 5,000 Hz, (A weighted scale) and it perceives a sound within that range as being more intense than a sound with a higher or lower frequency with the same magnitude. For purposes of this analysis, the A-scale weighting is typically reported in terms of A-weighted decibel (dBA). Typically, the human ear can barely perceive the change in noise level of three dB. A change in five dB is readily perceptible, and a change in 10 dB is perceived as being twice or half as loud. As previously discussed, a doubling of sound energy results in a three dB increase in sound, which means that a doubling of sound energy (e.g., doubling the volume of traffic on a highway) would result in a barely perceptible change in sound level.

#### Noise Descriptors

Noise in our daily environment fluctuates over time. Some noise levels occur in regular patterns, others are random. Some noise levels are constant while others are sporadic. Noise descriptors were created to describe the different time-varying noise levels.

*A-Weighted Sound Level:* The sound pressure level in decibels as measured on a sound level meter using the A-weighted filter network. The A-weighting filter de-emphasizes the very low and very high frequency components of the sound in a manner similar to the response of the human ear. A numerical method of rating human judgment of loudness.

*Ambient Noise Level:* The composite of noise from all sources, near and far. In this context, the ambient noise level constitutes the normal or existing level of environmental noise at a given

location.

Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL): The average equivalent A-weighted sound level during a 24-hour day, obtained after addition of five decibels to sound levels in the evening from 7:00 PM to 10:00 PM and after addition of 10 decibels to sound levels in the night before 7:00 AM and after 10:00 PM.

Decibel (dB): A unit for measuring the amplitude of a sound, equal to 20 times the logarithm to the base 10 of the ratio of the pressure of the sound measured to the reference pressure, which is 20 micro-pascals.

dB(A): A-weighted sound level (see definition above).

Equivalent Sound Level (LEQ): The sound level corresponding to a steady noise level over a given sample period with the same amount of acoustic energy as the actual time varying noise level. The energy average noise level during the sample period.

Habitable Room: Any room meeting the requirements of the Uniform Building Code or other applicable regulations which is intended to be used for sleeping, living, cooking or dining purposes, excluding such enclosed spaces as closets, pantries, bath or toilet rooms, service rooms, connecting corridors, laundries, unfinished attics, foyers, storage spaces, cellars, utility rooms and similar spaces.

L(n): The A-weighted sound level exceeded during a certain percentage of the sample time. For example, L10 is the sound level exceeded 10 percent of the sample time. Similarly, L50, L90 and L99, etc.

Noise: Any unwanted sound or sound which is undesirable because it interferes with speech and hearing, or is intense enough to damage hearing, or is otherwise annoying. The State Noise Control Act defines noise as "...excessive undesirable sound...".

Outdoor Living Area: Outdoor spaces that are associated with residential land uses typically used for passive recreational activities or other noise-sensitive uses. Such spaces include patio areas, barbecue areas, jacuzzi areas, etc. associated with residential uses; outdoor patient recovery or resting areas associated with hospitals, convalescent hospitals, or rest homes; outdoor areas associated with places of worship which have a significant role in services or other noise-sensitive activities; and outdoor school facilities routinely used for educational purposes which may be adversely impacted by noise. Outdoor areas usually not included in this definition are: front yard areas, driveways, greenbelts, maintenance areas and storage areas associated with residential land uses; exterior areas at hospitals that are not used for patient activities; outdoor areas associated with places of worship and principally used for short-term social gatherings; and, outdoor areas associated with school facilities that are not typically associated with educational uses prone to adverse noise impacts (e.g., school play yard areas).

Percent Noise Levels: See L(n).

Sound Level (Noise Level): The weighted sound pressure level obtained by use of a sound level meter having a standard frequency-filter for attenuating part of the sound spectrum.

Sound Level Meter: An instrument, including a microphone, an amplifier, an output meter, and frequency weighting networks for the measurement and determination of noise and sound levels.

Single Event Noise Exposure Level (SENEL): The dB(A) level which, if it lasted for one second, would produce the same A-weighted sound energy as the actual event.

#### Traffic Noise Prediction

Noise levels associated with traffic depends on a variety of factors: (1) volume of traffic, (2) speed of traffic, (3) auto, medium truck (2–3 axle) and heavy truck percentage (4 axle and greater), and sound propagation. The greater the volume of traffic, higher speeds, and truck percentages equate to a louder volume in noise. A doubling of the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) along a roadway will increase noise levels by approximately three dB.

#### Sound Propagation

As sound propagates from a source it spreads geometrically. Sound from a small, localized source (i.e., a point source) radiates uniformly outward as it travels away from the source in a spherical pattern. The sound level attenuates at a rate of six dB per doubling of distance. The movement of vehicles down a roadway makes the source of the sound appear to propagate from a line (i.e., line source) rather than a point source. This line source results in the noise propagating from a roadway in a cylindrical spreading versus a spherical spreading that results from a point source. The sound level attenuates for a line source at a rate of three dB per doubling of distance.

As noise propagates from the source, it is affected by the ground and atmosphere. Noise models use hard site (reflective surfaces) and soft site (absorptive surfaces) to help calculate predicted noise levels. Hard site conditions assume no excessive ground absorption between the noise source and the receiver. Soft site conditions such as grass, soft dirt or landscaping attenuate noise at a rate of 1.5 dB per doubling of distance. When added to the geometric spreading, the excess ground attenuation results in an overall noise attenuation of 4.5 dB per doubling of distance for a line source and 7.5 dB per doubling of distance for a point source.

Research has demonstrated that atmospheric conditions can have a significant effect on noise levels when noise receivers are located 200 feet from a noise source. Wind, temperature, air humidity and turbulence can further impact how far sound can travel.

### **Ground-Borne Vibration Fundamentals**

#### Vibration Descriptors

Ground-borne vibrations consist of rapidly fluctuating motions within the ground that have an

average motion of zero. The effects of ground-borne vibrations typically only cause a nuisance to people, but at extreme vibration levels, damage to buildings may occur. Although ground-borne vibration can be felt outdoors, it is typically only an annoyance to people indoors where the associated effects of the shaking of a building can be notable. Ground-borne noise is an effect of ground-borne vibration and only exists indoors, since it is produced from noise radiated from the motion of the walls and floors of a room and may also consist of the rattling of windows or dishes on shelves.

Several different methods are used to quantify vibration amplitude.

- PPV – Known as the peak particle velocity (PPV) which is the maximum instantaneous peak in vibration velocity, typically given in inches per second.
- RMS – Known as root mean squared (RMS) can be used to denote vibration amplitude.
- VdB – A commonly used abbreviation to describe the vibration level (VdB) for a vibration source.

#### Vibration Perception

Typically, developed areas are continuously affected by vibration velocities of 50 VdB or lower. These continuous vibrations are not noticeable to humans whose threshold of perception is around 65 VdB. Outdoor sources that may produce perceptible vibrations are usually caused by construction equipment, steel-wheeled trains, and traffic on rough roads, while smooth roads rarely produce perceptible groundborne noise or vibration. To counter the effects of ground-borne vibration, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has published guidance relative to vibration impacts. According to the FTA, fragile buildings can be exposed to ground-borne vibration levels of 0.3 inches per second without experiencing structural damage.

There are three main types of vibration propagation: surface, compression, and shear waves. Surface waves, or Rayleigh waves, travel along the ground's surface. These waves carry most of their energy along an expanding circular wave front, similar to ripples produced by throwing a rock into a pool of water. P-waves, or compression waves, are body waves that carry their energy along an expanding spherical wave front. The particle motion in these waves is longitudinal (i.e., in a "push-pull" fashion). P-waves are analogous to airborne sound waves. S-waves, or shear waves, are also body waves that carry energy along an expanding spherical wave front. However, unlike P-waves, the particle motion is transverse, or side-to-side and perpendicular to the direction of propagation. As vibration waves propagate from a source, the vibration energy decreases in a logarithmic nature and the vibration levels typically decrease by six VdB per doubling of the distance from the vibration source. As stated above, this drop-off rate can vary greatly depending on the soil but has been shown to be effective enough for screening purposes, in order to identify potential vibration impacts that may need to be studied through actual field tests.

## **Existing Noise Environment**

### Sensitive Receptors

The closest sensitive receptors to the Project site are the existing residential uses located approximately 185 feet west of the Project site.

### Noise Measurements

Two, 24-hour noise measurements were conducted near the proposed travel center site in order to document the existing noise environment; refer to Appendix F for the noise measurement locations. The measurements include the 1-hour Leq, Lmin, Lmax and other statistical data (e.g., L2, L8). The results of the noise measurement are presented in Tables 6 and 7 of the Noise Study; refer to Appendix F. The noise measurements indicate that ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity range between 57.2 and 65.8 dBA Leq (Long-Term Measurement Location 1) and between 47.5 and 55.6 dBA Leq (Long Term Measurement Location 2). The overall CNEL ranged between 60.2 to 69.7 dBA CNEL. The field data indicates that both local roadway and railroad noise are the dominant noise sources.

## **Regulatory Framework**

The City of Palmdale outlines noise regulations and standards within the Noise Element of the City's General Plan and Chapter 9 the PMC.

### City of Palmdale General Plan

The City requires that acoustical analysis reports include an evaluation of impacts associated with noise levels at the project site as well as the impact of the project on the existing noise environment. Where appropriate, the City will require acoustical analysis reports to include acoustical design to achieve the appropriate interior and exterior noise levels through sound insulation, or other means, as indicated in Table 10, Maximum Acceptable Noise Levels. For commercial land uses, an interior noise level of 55 dBA Leq would apply to the proposed commercial building, and a "noise level which does not interfere with normal business activity" is the standard for on-site exterior noise levels.

**Table 10: Maximum Acceptable Noise Levels**

| Land Use   | Exterior  | Interior | Scale     |
|--|---|----------|-----------|
| <b>Residential</b>   |   |          |           |
| SFR  | 65  | 45       | dBA, CNEL |
| MFR  | 65  | 45       | dBA, CNEL |
| MHP  | 65  | 45       | dBA, CNEL |
| <b>Commercial including, but not limited to:</b>           |   |          |           |
| Retail   | A noise level which does not jeopardize health, safety, and welfare of visitors | 55       | Leq(h)    |
| Services   |   | 55       | Leq(h)    |
| Office   |   | 55       | Leq(h)    |
| <b>Institutional including, but not limited to:</b>        |   |          |           |
| Schools  | A noise level which does not jeopardize health, safety, and welfare of visitors | 45       | Leq(h)    |
| Hospitals  |   | 45       | Leq(h)    |
| Nursing Homes  |   | 45       | Leq(h)    |
| <b>Industrial including, but not limited to:</b>           |   |          |           |
| Industrial Park  | A noise level which does not interfere with normal business activity            | 65       | Leq(h)    |
| Business Park  |   | 65       | Leq(h)    |
| Quarry   | Maximum 65 Leq(h) at the interface with residentially designated land           | n/a      | n/a       |
| Source: City of Palmdale General Plan Noise Element, 1993. |   |          |           |

**City of Palmdale Municipal Code**

PMC Section 9.18.101, *Noise*, makes it unlawful for any person to willfully make or continue, or cause or permit to be made or continued, any loud, unnecessary, or unusual noise which unreasonably disturbs the peace and quiet of any neighborhood or which causes discomfort or annoyance to any reasonable person of normal sensitiveness residing in the area. The characteristics and conditions, which may be considered in determining whether such noise violates the provisions of this section, shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- (1) The volume of the noise;
- (2) The intensity of the noise;
- (3) Whether the nature of the noise is usual or unusual;
- (4) Whether the origin of the noise is natural or unnatural;
- (5) The volume and intensity of the background noise, if any;
- (6) The proximity of the noise to sleeping facilities;
- (7) The nature and zoning of the area within which the noise emanates;
- (8) The density of the inhabitation of the area within which the noise emanates;

- (9) The time of the day or night the noise occurs;
- (10) The duration of the noise;
- (11) Whether the noise is recurrent, intermittent, or constant; and,
- (12) Whether the noise is produced by a commercial or noncommercial activity.

Section 9.28.030, *Construction noise prohibited in residential zones*, states except as otherwise provided in this chapter, no person shall perform any construction or repair work on any Sunday, or any other day after 8:00 p.m. or before 6:30 a.m., in any residential zone or within 500 feet of any residence, hotel, motel or recreational vehicle park.

The City of Palmdale has not adopted a numerical threshold that identifies what a substantial increase would be. For purposes of this analysis, the FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (2006) criteria will be used to establish significance thresholds. The FTA provides reasonable criteria for assessing construction noise impacts based on the potential for adverse community reaction. For residential uses, the daytime noise threshold is 80 dBA Leq averaged over an 8-hour period (Leq (8-hr)); and the nighttime noise threshold is 70 dBA Leq (8-hr). For commercial uses, the daytime and nighttime noise threshold is 85 dBA Leq (8-hr). In compliance with the City's Code, it is assumed that construction would not occur during the noise-sensitive nighttime hours.

### **Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

- a) ***Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?***

### **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.**

#### Construction Noise

The degree of construction noise may vary for different areas of the Project site and also vary depending on the construction activities. Project construction would occur in four phases, site preparation, grading, building construction, and architectural coating. Typical noise levels associated with construction equipment are shown in Table 11, Typical Construction Noise Levels.

**Table 11: Typical Construction Noise Levels**

| Type   | Noise Levels (dBA) at 50 feet |
|--|-------------------------------|
| <b>Earth Moving</b>  |                               |
| Compactors (Rollers)   | 73-76                         |
| Front Loaders  | 73-84                         |
| Backhoes   | 73-92                         |
| Tractors   | 75-95                         |
| Scrapers, Graders  | 78-92                         |
| Pavers   | 85-87                         |
| Trucks   | 81-94                         |
| <b>Materials Handling</b>  |                               |
| Concrete Mixers  | 72-87                         |
| Concrete Pumps   | 81-83                         |
| Cranes (Movable)   | 72-86                         |
| Cranes (Derrick)   | 85-87                         |
| <b>Stationary</b>  |                               |
| Pumps  | 68-71                         |
| Generators   | 71-83                         |
| Compressors  | 75-86                         |
| <b>Impact Equipment</b>  |                               |
| Saws   | 71-82                         |
| Vibrators  | 68-82                         |
| Note: Referenced noise levels from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) |                               |

Construction noise associated with each phase of the Project was calculated at nearby sensitive receptors utilizing methodology presented in the FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018) together with several key construction parameters including: distance to each sensitive receiver, equipment usage, percent usage factor, and baseline parameters for the Project site. Construction equipment typically moves back and forth across the site; and it is an industry standard to use the acoustical center of the site to model average construction noise levels.

Construction activities are anticipated to include four phases: site preparation, grading, building construction, and architectural coating. Noise levels associated with each phase are shown in Table 12, Construction Noise Level by Phase (dBA, Leq).



**Table 12: Construction Noise Levels by Phase (dBA, Leq)**

| Activity              | Noise Levels at Nearest Sensitive Receptor |      |
|-----------------------|--|------|
|                       | Leq  | Lmax |
| Site Preparation      | 79   | 83   |
| Grading               | 79   | 80   |
| Building Construction | 77   | 78   |
| Architectural Coating | 73   | 77   |

Construction modeling worksheets are provided in Appendix F.

As shown in NOI-3, Project construction noise would range between 73 and 79 dBA Leq dBA Lmax at nearby sensitive receptors. Measured noise levels at the noise measurement location representative of the nearest sensitive receptors ranged between 57.2 to 65.8 dBA Leq.

The Project would be required to adhere to PMC Section 9.28.030 which prohibits construction or repair work on any Sunday, or any other day after 8:00 p.m. or before 6:30 a.m., in any residential zone or within 500 feet of any residence, hotel, motel or recreational vehicle park; refer to Mitigation Measure NOI-1.

As discussed previously, the City of Palmdale has not adopted a numerical threshold for noise associated with construction activities. For purposes of this analysis, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (2006) criteria is used to establish significance thresholds. The FTA provides reasonable criteria for assessing construction noise impacts based on the potential for adverse community reaction. For residential uses, the daytime noise threshold is 80 dBA Leq averaged over an 8-hour period (Leq [8-hr]); and the nighttime noise threshold is 70 dBA Leq (8-hr). For commercial uses, the daytime and nighttime noise threshold is 85 dBA Leq (8-hr). As the Project would be required to comply with the PMC regarding construction hours, the analysis assumes that construction would not occur during the noise-sensitive nighttime hours.

The Leq (8-hr) associated with Project construction would range between 73 and 79 dBA depending upon the construction phase, and would not exceed the FTA criteria for impacts to residential or commercial land uses. This impact would be less than significant. To further reduce potential noise impacts, Mitigation Measure NOI-2, which includes standard best management practices for reducing noise associated with construction activities, would be implemented.

### Operational Noise

#### *Off-Site Traffic Noise Impacts*

The potential off-site noise impacts caused by the increase in vehicular traffic as a result of the proposed Pilot Travel Center were calculated at a distance of 50 feet from affected road

segments. The noise level at 50 feet both with and without Project generated vehicle traffic was compared and the increase calculated. The distance to the 55, 60, 65, and 70 dBA CNEL noise contours are also provided for reference; refer to Appendix F.

Noise contours were calculated for the following scenarios and conditions:

- Existing Condition: This scenario refers to the existing year traffic noise condition
- Existing With Project Condition: This scenario refers to the existing year with Project traffic noise condition

As shown in Table 13, Project Change in Existing Traffic Noise Levels, the addition of Project generated vehicle traffic to Pearblossom Highway and Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 would result in negligible increases in ambient noise levels above existing conditions and would not be significant.

**Table 13: Project Change in Existing Traffic Noise Levels**

| Roadway                     | Segment   | Modeled Noise Levels (dBA CNEL) at 50 feet from the Centerline |                       |                       |   |
|-----------------------------|---|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|---|
|                             |   | Existing   | Existing With Project | Change in Noise Level | Increase in three dB or more <sup>1</sup> |
| Pearblossom Highway         | 47 <sup>th</sup> Street East to Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 | 75.9   | 76.1                  | 0.2                   | No  |
| Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 | East Avenue S-8 to Pearblossom Highway                      | 76.2   | 76.3                  | 0.1                   | No  |
| Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 | South of Pearblossom Highway                                | 75.5   | 75.7                  | 0.2                   | No  |
|                             |   |  |                       |                       |   |

FHWA roadway noise modeling worksheets are provided in Appendix F.  
1. Typically, the human ear can barely perceive the change in noise level of three dB.

*On-site Traffic Noise Impact*

Future noise levels associated with Pearblossom Highway and Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 were modeled using the SoundPLAN noise model in order to evaluate the Project in light of the City’s exterior standards presented in Table 10. The maximum acceptable exterior noise level for commercial land uses is “a noise level which does not jeopardize health, safety, and welfare of visitors”; and a maximum interior noise level for commercial land uses is 55 dBA Leq(h). The California State Code of Regulations has established a permissible exposure limit for noise that is an 8-hour time-weighted average proposed outdoor uses, i.e., parking and fueling areas are expected to reach up to 75 dBA Leq(h), and would not exceed the 8-hour time-weighted average of 85 dBA.

The expected interior noise level of the proposed travel center commercial building is the difference between the projected exterior noise level at the structure's facade and the noise reduction provided by the structure itself. Typical commercial building construction will provide a noise level reduction of 20 dBA with a "windows closed" condition. A "windows closed" condition requires mechanical fresh air ventilation (e.g., air conditioning). Interior noise levels associated with the proposed travel center building may reach up to 52.4 dB Leq and are not expected to exceed the City's interior noise standard for commercial buildings of 55 dBA Leq.

#### *Stationary Noise*

The existing single family residential land uses located approximately 185 feet west of the Project site are sensitive receptors that may be affected by Project operational noise. Worst-case operational noise was modeled using SoundPlan acoustical modeling software.

One receptor representative of the Project's western property line and two receptors representative of existing single family homes located west of the Project site were modeled using the SoundPLAN noise model to evaluate the proposed travel center's operational impact. A receptor represents either an existing building, a property line, or a sensitive receptor such as an outdoor sensitive area (courtyard, patio, backyard, etc.).

Project Operational Noise Levels. Worst-case "Project only" operational noise levels at the western property line are expected to reach 62.9 dBA CNEL and up to 48.3 dBA Leq at the nearest sensitive receptors (single family residences to the west). Project operational noise would not exceed the City's 65 dBA CNEL daytime exterior residential noise limit or 45 dBA interior residential limit identified in Table 10. Typical newer residential construction provides a noise level reduction of 15 dB with a "windows open" condition and a 20 dB with a "windows closed" condition; a "windows closed" condition requires mechanical fresh air ventilation (e.g., air conditioning). Refer to Appendix F for noise contours.

Project Plus Ambient Operational Noise Levels. As stated above, existing with Project noise level projections are anticipated to reach 48.3 dBA Leq at the nearest sensitive receptors. Measured noise levels at the noise measurement location representative of the sensitive receptors ranged between 57.2 to 65.8 dBA Leq. When adding two noise levels that are between four and nine dB in difference from each other, the resulting sum is one dB higher than the higher of the two values. Project generated operational noise is expected to result in a one dB increase in ambient noise levels.

As discussed above, the Project would not generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established by the City and impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction activities can produce vibration that may be felt by adjacent land uses. The construction of the proposed Project would not require the use of equipment such as pile drivers, which are known to generate substantial construction vibration levels. The primary vibration source during construction may be from a bull dozer. A large bull dozer has a vibration impact of 0.089 inches per second peak particle velocity (PPV) at 25 feet which is perceptible but below any risk to architectural damage.

The Caltrans Transportation and Construction Induced Vibration Guidance Manual provides general thresholds and guidelines as to the vibration damage potential from vibration impacts. Table 14, Guideline Vibration Damage Potential Threshold Criteria, identifies the thresholds and Table 15, Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment, identifies the approximate vibration levels for particular construction activities at a distance of 25 feet.

**Table 14: Guideline Vibration Damage Potential Threshold Criteria**

| Structure and Condition  | Maximum PPV (in/sec) |  |
|--|----------------------|--|
|  | Transient Sources    | Continuous/Frequent Intermittent Sources |
| Extremely fragile historic buildings, ruins, ancient monuments   | 0.12                 | 0.08                                     |
| Fragile buildings  | 0.2                  | 0.1                                      |
| Historic and some older buildings  | 0.5                  | 0.25                                     |
| Older residential structures   | 0.5                  | 0.3                                      |
| New residential structures   | 1.0                  | 0.5                                      |
| Modern industrial/commercial buildings   | 2.0                  | 0.5                                      |
| Source: Caltrans, <i>Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual</i> , Table 19, September 2013.   |                      |  |
| Note: Transient sources create a single isolated vibration event, such as blasting or drop balls. Continuous/frequent intermittent sources include impact pile drivers, pogo-stick compactors, crack-and-seat equipment, vibratory pile drivers, and vibratory compaction equipment. |                      |  |

**Table 15: Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment**

| Equipment                      | Peak Particle Velocity (inches/second) at 25 feet | Approximate Vibration Level LV (dVB) at 25 feet |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
| Pile driver (impact)           | 1.518 (upper range)                               | 112   |
|                                | 0.644 (typical)                                   | 104   |
| Pile driver (sonic)            | 0.734 (upper range)                               | 105   |
|                                | 0.170 (typical)                                   | 93  |
| Clam shovel drop (slurry wall) | 0.202   | 94  |
| Hydromill                      | 0.008 (in soil)                                   | 66  |
| Slurry wall                    | 0.017 (in rock)                                   | 75  |
| Vibratory roller               | 0.21  | 94  |
| Hoe ram                        | 0.089   | 87  |
| Large bulldozer                | 0.089   | 87  |
| Caisson drill                  | 0.089   | 87  |
| Loaded trucks                  | 0.076   | 86  |
| Jackhammer                     | 0.035   | 79  |
| Small bulldozer                | 0.003   | 58  |

Source: Federal Transit Administration, *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, May 2006.

As stated, the nearest sensitive receptors are approximately 185 feet west of the Project site. At this distance, a large bulldozer would yield a worst-case 0.01 PPV (in/sec) which would not be perceptible or result in architectural damage. The Project would not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels and impacts would be less than significant.

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

**No Impact.** The Project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public or public use airport. The closest airport to the Project site is Palmdale Regional Airport and Air Force Plant 42, located approximately 5.5 miles northwest of the Project site. The Project would not expose people working in the Project site to excessive noise levels associated with airport activities.

**Mitigation Measures**

**NOI-1:** The Project shall be prohibited from conducting construction activities on any Sunday, or any other day after 8:00 p.m. or before 6:30 a.m.

**NOI-2:** In addition to complying with Mitigation Measure NOI-1, the following measures

shall be implemented to reduce construction noise.

- During construction, the contractor shall ensure all construction equipment is equipped with appropriate noise attenuating devices.
- The contractor should locate equipment staging areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise/vibration sources and sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction.
- Idling equipment should be turned off when not in use.
- Equipment shall be maintained so that vehicles and their loads are secured from rattling and banging.

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                           |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>XIV POPULATION AND HOUSING</b>   |                                |   |                                     |                                     |
| Would the Project:  |                                |   |                                     |                                     |
| a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

- a) *Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project proposes development of a travel center, which would involve the development of fueling facilities, travel amenities, restaurants, and parking facilities for passing motorists and commercial truck operators and would not induce substantial unplanned population growth directly through new homes or indirectly through the extension of roads or other infrastructure. The Project site and surrounding area are currently served by adjacent roadways and utility infrastructure is located within the area for extension to the Project site. Development of the site with the proposed commercial use would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation and zoning for the site. The Project’s employment growth could result in population growth within the City, as employees (and their families) may choose to relocate to the City. The proposed travel center is anticipated to have 70 employees. It should be noted that estimating the number of future employees who would choose to relocate to the City would be highly speculative since many factors influence personal housing location decisions (i.e., family income levels and the cost and availability of suitable housing in the local area). Further the proposed use does not typically provide employment opportunities that involve substantial numbers of people needing to permanently locate to fill the positions, but would rather provide employment opportunities to people within the local community and surrounding areas. Assuming 70 new employees (and their families) relocate to Palmdale, Project implementation would result in a potential population increase of approximately 250 persons.<sup>7</sup> This is a

<sup>7</sup> Based upon an average household size of 3.57 persons per household per the State of California, Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State – January 1, 2011-2020*, Sacramento, California, May 2020.

conservative assumption, as it assumes all employees would relocate to the City along with their families instead of the more likely scenario of existing Palmdale or other nearby residents filling some of the new employment opportunities. The forecast population growth would increase the City's existing (2020) population of 156,737 persons by less than one-half of one percent (approximately 0.2 percent) to 156,987 persons. The Palmdale General Plan anticipated a population of 264,216 persons by 2010 and 441,280 persons at buildout of the City and sphere of influence under the uses permitted by the General Plan. The Project would be within the population projections anticipated and planned for by the City's General Plan and would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area; impacts would be less than significant.

**b) *Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

**No impact.** The Project site is comprised of an existing swap meet use and associated parking and does not contain any housing. Therefore, the Project would not displace any existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.



|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                           |
|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>XV PUBLIC SERVICES</b>  |                                |   |                                     |                                     |
| Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services: |                                |   |                                     |                                     |
| a) Fire protection?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b) Police protection?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) Schools?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| d) Parks?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Other public facilities?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

***Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:***

**a) *Fire protection?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Fire protection services for the City of Palmdale are provided by the LACFD. There are five stations within the City of Palmdale: Stations 93, 24, 37, 131, and 136. The station nearest to the Project site is Station 93, located approximately 1.93 miles northeast of the site. The introduction of the proposed travel center to the site could increase the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services to the site when compared to existing conditions. PMC Chapter 3.42, *Fire Facilities Impact Fee Requirements*, requires new development to pay a fire facilities impact fee. The intent is to require every person who develops land to mitigate the impacts of that development on the City’s public facilities. Therefore, the City requires developers to pay a fire facilities impact fee that would be used to meet the demand for fire protection facilities created by development.

As part of the development review process, the Applicant would be required to submit appropriate plans for plan review to ensure compliance with zoning, building, and fire codes. The LACFD would review the Project for access requirements, minimum roadway widths, fire apparatus access roads, fire lanes, signage, access walkways, among other requirements to ensure adequate emergency access would be provided to and within the Project site. The Project would be required to comply with all applicable Building and Fire Code requirements and would submit

construction plans to the Fire Department's Engineering Building Plan Check Unit for review and approval prior to issuance of any building permit. The proposed development would be required to comply with applicable City, County, and State code and ordinance requirements for fire protection. Implementation of all Fire Code requirements would further reduce potential impacts concerning fire protection services. The Project would not require the need for new or physically altered fire station facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives and impacts would be less than significant.

**b) Police protection?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Law enforcement is provided by contract with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. Services for the Project would be based out of the Palmdale Sheriff Station, located at 750 East Avenue Q, approximately 5.5 miles northwest of the Project site. Project implementation is not expected to decrease response times or require the construction of new police protection facilities. Impacts would be less than significant. The introduction of the proposed travel center to the site could increase the demand for police services to the site when compared to existing conditions. PMC Chapter 3.45, *Public Facility Development Impact Fee Requirements*, requires new development to pay a public facility development impact fee. The intent is to require every person who develops land to mitigate the impacts of that development on the City's public facilities. Therefore, the City requires developers to pay a public facility development impact fee that would be used to meet the demand for public facilities, including public safety facilities, created by development. Further, as part of the development review process, the Sheriff's Department would review the Project and provide comments and/or conditions of approval. The Project Applicant would be required to comply with any specific conditions related to safety and security. The Project would not require the need for new or physically altered police facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives and impacts would be less than significant.

**c) Schools?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project does not propose the development of residential uses; therefore, the Project would not result in new students to the local school districts. The Project would be subject to payment of school impact fees in accordance with Senate Bill 50 (SB 50). Pursuant to Government Code §65995(3)(h), payment of statutory fees is deemed to be full and complete mitigation of impacts of any legislative or adjudicative act, or both, involving, but not limited to, the planning, use or development of real property..." Developer fees collected by the local school district pursuant to SB 50 are used for the provision of additional and reconstructed or modernized school facilities. The Project Applicant would be required to pay all statutory fees in place at the time and demonstrate proof of payment to the City. With payment of the fees, Project impacts to schools would be less than significant.

**d)     *Parks?***

**No Impact.** The Project site is comprised of an existing swap meet use and associated parking and does not provide public park or recreational opportunities. The proposed travel center would include fueling facilities, travel amenities, restaurants, and parking facilities for passing motorists and commercial truck operators. As discussed in Section XIV, Population and Housing, the Project would not result in direct population growth or significant indirect population growth resulting in the need for new or physically altered park facilities. Therefore, no impacts to parks would occur.

**e)     *Other public facilities?***

**No Impact.** The proposed travel center would include fueling facilities, travel amenities, restaurants, and parking facilities for passing motorists and commercial truck operators. As discussed in Section XIV, Population and Housing, the Project would not result in direct population growth or significant indirect population growth resulting in the need for new or physically altered public facilities to adequately serve the community. Therefore, no impacts to public facilities would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact                           |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>XVI RECREATION</b>   |                                |   |                              |                                     |
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?                       | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

a) ***Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?***

**No Impact.** Refer to Response XV(d).

b) ***Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?***

**No Impact.** Refer to Response XV(d). The Project proposes the development of a travel center, which would include fueling facilities, travel amenities, restaurants, and parking facilities for passing motorists and commercial truck operators. The development of recreational facilities is not proposed as part of the Project.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                |
|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>XVII TRANSPORTATION</b>   |                                |   |                                     |                          |
| Would the Project:   |                                |   |                                     |                          |
| a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?         | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(1)?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curve or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in inadequate emergency access?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

This section is based in part on the Traffic Study for Pilot Travel Center (Traffic Study) prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., dated January 2021 and Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis (VMT Analysis) prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., dated January 2021 and included in their entirety as Appendix G, Transportation Analysis.

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

- a) *Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?***

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.**

Roadway Facilities

The City of Palmdale General Plan Circulation Element includes Policy C1.4.1 establishing a minimum acceptable level of service (LOS) of C or better to the extent practical for intersections; in some circumstances a LOS D may be acceptable for a short duration during peak periods.

The Traffic Study documents existing conditions, future conditions, and project-related deficiencies at the following study intersections and roadway segments:

Study Intersections:

- Pearblossom Highway at Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138;
- Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 at Driveway 1 (future conditions);
- Pearblossom Highway at Driveway 2 (future conditions); and,

- Pearblossom Highway at Driveway 3 (future conditions).

Study Roadway Segments:

- Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138: North of Pearblossom Highway; and,
- Pearblossom Highway: West of Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138.

*Existing Conditions Levels of Service*

Under existing conditions, the Pearblossom Highway at Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 intersection is operating at an unacceptable LOS (LOS D or worse):

- Fort Tejon Road/SR-138 at Pearblossom Highway – LOS E, PM Peak Hour

The two study roadway segments are currently operating at an acceptable LOS under existing conditions:

- Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138: North of Pearblossom Highway – LOS A; and,
- Pearblossom Highway: West of Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 – LOS A.

Project Trip Generation

Trip generation estimates for the proposed travel center are based on daily and peak hour trip generation rates obtained from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (10<sup>th</sup> Edition) and additional sources. Based on the ITE trip rates, the Project is anticipated to generate primary trips consisting of 1,296 daily trips with 138 AM peak hour and 133 PM peak hour trips.<sup>8</sup>

*Opening Year 2022 Without Project Conditions*

The Project Opening Year is anticipated to be 2022. An ambient growth rate per year was applied to existing traffic volumes to capture background traffic growth. Based on the intersection LOS analysis for Opening Year 2022 Without Project conditions, the following intersection is projected to continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS (LOS D or worse):

- Fort Tejon Road/SR-138 at Pearblossom Highway – LOS E, PM Peak Hour

Roadway LOS analysis was conducted for Opening Year 2022 Without Project conditions and all study roadway segments are projected to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS:

- Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138: North of Pearblossom Highway – LOS A; and,
- Pearblossom Highway: West of Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 – LOS A.

*Opening Year 2022 With Project Conditions*

Project related traffic was added to the Opening Year 2022 traffic volumes. The intersection LOS analysis indicates that all study intersections would operate at an acceptable LOS under Opening Year 2022 With Project Conditions, except for the following:

---

<sup>8</sup> Primary trips are new vehicle trips that are assumed to be added to the network as a result of development of the proposed travel center.

- Fort Tejon Road/SR-138 at Pearblossom Highway – LOS D, AM Peak Hour and LOS E, PM Peak Hour

Roadway LOS analysis was also conducted for Opening Year 2022 With Project conditions and all study roadway segments are projected to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS:

- Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138: North of Pearblossom Highway – LOS A; and,
- Pearblossom Highway: West of Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 – LOS A.

*Opening Year 2022 Plus Cumulative Project Conditions*

Opening Year 2022 Plus Cumulative Project conditions were developed by applying an annual growth rate per year to existing conditions to account for background ambient traffic growth and the addition of nearby cumulative projects that are assumed to be open and operating at the time of the Project opening year.

Based on the intersection LOS analysis for Opening Year 2022 Plus Cumulative Project conditions, the following intersection is projected to operate at an unacceptable LOS (LOS D or worse):

- Fort Tejon Road/SR-138 at Pearblossom Highway – LOS E, PM Peak Hour

Roadway LOS analysis was also conducted for Opening Year 2022 Plus Cumulative Project conditions and all study roadway segments are projected to operate at an acceptable LOS:

- Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138: North of Pearblossom Highway – LOS A; and,
- Pearblossom Highway: West of Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 – LOS A.

*Opening Year 2022 Plus Cumulative Project and With Project Conditions*

Project-related traffic was added to the Opening Year 2022 Plus Cumulative Project conditions. The intersection LOS analysis indicates that all study intersections would operate at an acceptable LOS under Opening Year 2022 Plus Cumulative Project With Project conditions, except for the following:

- Fort Tejon Road/SR-138 at Pearblossom Highway – LOS D, AM Peak Hour and LOS E, PM Peak Hour

Roadway LOS analysis was also conducted for Opening Year 2022 Plus Cumulative Project With Project conditions and all study roadway segments are projected to operate at an acceptable LOS:

- Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138: North of Pearblossom Highway – LOS A; and,
- Pearblossom Highway: West of Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 – LOS A.

Based on the City of Palmdale's LOS standards and deficiency criteria, the Project-related deficiencies would occur at the following intersection under Opening Year 2022 With Project conditions and Opening Year Plus Cumulative Project With Project Conditions:

- Fort Tejon Road/SR-138 at Pearblossom Highway – LOS D, AM Peak Hour and LOS E,

#### PM Peak Hour

Specifically, with the addition of Project trips, this intersection is projected to degrade from LOS C to LOS D during the AM peak hour and from LOS E to a worse LOS E during the PM peak hour.

#### *Proposed Improvement*

In order to improve the unacceptable LOS for both the Opening Year 2022 With Project and Opening Year Plus Cumulative Projects With Project conditions, the following improvement has been identified:

- Optimize cycle length and signal timings and provide an eastbound right-turn overlap phase.

With this improvement, the intersection of Fort Tejon Road/SR-138 and Pearblossom Highway is projected to operate at LOS C during the AM and PM peak hours.

The Project would be required to make a fair-share contribution toward this improvement (Mitigation Measure TRA-1), to eliminate the conflict with General Plan Policy C1.4.1 establishing a minimum acceptable LOS of C or better. With implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-1, impacts would be less than significant.

#### Transit, Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

There are no transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities located adjacent to the Project site. Sidewalk facilities are located west of the site, adjacent to the existing residential subdivision.

The Project proposes the development of a travel center, which would include fueling facilities, travel amenities, restaurants, and parking facilities for passing motorists and commercial truck operators. As part of the Project, Pearblossom Highway is proposed to be widened to its ultimate half-width right-of-way from the Project site's western property line to the proposed travel center's easterly property line, which includes the shared roadway. Additionally, the Project proposes to install a sidewalk along the entire frontage of the proposed travel center site, consistent with the sidewalk located further west, which would improve pedestrian access within the area of the Project site.

The City of Palmdale Bikeway and Multi-Purpose Trail Plan (dated August 20, 2019) identifies Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 as an Adopted Master Plan Route. However, as stated, no facilities currently exist within the area. The proposed Project would not prohibit or interfere with the Bikeway and Multi-Purpose Trail Plan or any other program plan, ordinance or policy addressing transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.



**b) *Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(1)?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** In response to Senate Bill (SB) 743, the City of Palmdale has adopted new Transportation Impact Guidelines and now relies on vehicle miles travelled (VMT) as the measure for determining a project significant transportation impact under the CEQA process. The Los Angeles County Guidelines provides details on appropriate screening thresholds that can be used to identify when a proposed land use project is anticipated to result in a less than significant impact without conducting a more detailed level analysis. Screening thresholds are divided into the following three steps:

1. Transit Priority Area (TPA) Screening
2. Low VMT Area Screening
3. Project Type Screening

A land use project needs only meet one of the above screening thresholds to be presumed to not result in a significant impact under CEQA pursuant to SB 743.

The Technical Advisory on Evaluating transportation Impacts in CEQA (December 2018) prepared by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) identifies that by adding retail opportunities into the urban fabric and thereby improving retail destination proximity, local-serving retail development tends to shorten trips and reduce VMT. Generally, retail development including stores less than 50,000 square feet might be considered local serving. The proposed Project would be less than 50,000 square feet and is not anticipated to lead to substitution of longer trips for shorter ones. Therefore, the City may presume such development creates a less than significant transportation impact.

One of the major considerations in evaluating SB 743 considerations for a project, is how the December 2018 guidance provided by OPR or the lead agency's guidelines applies to its evaluation. The guidance does not specifically address the development of Travel Centers and as such there is no clear approach to evaluating this facility. In the absence of clear guidance by either OPR or the lead agency, a logical way to evaluate this type of facility is to consider the major trip purposes of the site in terms of their trip length and frequency. Given the description, four types of trips were broadly considered for this development given its context: (1) employee commute trips; (2) automobile and truck trips related to the Travel Center; (3) other trips related to functioning of the retail uses, and (4) local-serving retail trips. The following discussion is provided regarding these three broad trip types.

Employee commute trips. The City of Palmdale is a suburban community in character and as such it is understood that many of its residents travel considerable distance for employment. Most often an important strategy for reducing VMT in a community like this is to improve the local jobs/housing balance by increasing the number of employment opportunities. As such, it is reasonable to expect that increasing local employment

opportunities will reduce the average commuter trip lengths of residents, resulting in a net decrease to regional net VMT.

Automobile and Truck trips related to Travel Center. The OPR guidance indicates that, although heavy vehicle traffic can be included for analysis convenience, the provided analysis requirements are specific to passenger-vehicles and light duty trucks. It is generally understood that Interstate commerce and related heavy vehicle traffic are regulated by the federal government as it relates to commerce. Irrespective of this, it is reasonable to assume that the location of this Project adjacent to the intersection of Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 and Pearblossom Highway offers services for traveling public and truck drivers that are on the roadway system and need to stop for services. With the exception of employee commute trips described above, the trips for this type of use are generally pass-by or diverted link. Accordingly, it is reasonable to assume that the proposed Project would not generate new demand but meets existing demand that would shorten the distance that customers, or visitors would otherwise travel.

Other trips. These are often the smallest number and shortest distance of trips for a facility like this and include a broad range of trip types, such as, employee lunches off-site, maintenance teams for on-site infrastructure, supply deliveries, etc. As such their impact to the overall VMT of the site is likely minimal. Therefore, it is not likely that they are impactful to the local transportation system and are secondary to the other two trip types discussed.

Local-serving retail trips. New retail development typically redistributes shopping trips rather than creating new trips. By adding retail opportunities to the area thereby improving retail destination proximity, local-serving retail development tends to shorten trips and reduce VMT.

It is also worth noting that while this facility is expected to provide additional jobs and some related trips to the area, the facility itself is not expected to be the principal catalyst for new trips. Rather, it is anticipated that these trips would most likely occur regardless of whether this location were developed, as it is in response to an existing demand for services for road users already on the roadway network. Accordingly, if this site were not developed, a similar site would likely be developed elsewhere to meet this demand and as such the alternative to this development would likely not eliminate any related VMT. In consideration of this and the other considerations discussed above, the Project meets the Project Type screening threshold and is not anticipated to result in a significant impact under CEQA pursuant to SB 743. Therefore, the Project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(1) and impacts would be less than significant.

**c) *Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curve or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project does not propose any incompatible uses, as the Project proposes a travel center, which is consistent with the General Plan land use designation and zoning for the site. The Project proposes a shared roadway, which would extend north from Pearblossom Highway along the eastern edge of the proposed travel center site, providing access to the Project site. A driveway along the western edge of the proposed travel center site would provide auto only access from Pearblossom Highway to the auto fueling area. Additional access is proposed from Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 via a one-way roadway. The proposed one-way access from Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 would be provided by installing a right turn pocket along Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 and would consist of road surface and curbs only; no sidewalk or gutters are proposed. The Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 access would be granted through use of easements for shared access.

Pearblossom Highway is proposed to be widened to its ultimate half-width right-of-way from the Project site's western property line to the proposed travel center's easterly property line, which includes the shared roadway. At the intersection of the shared roadway and Pearblossom Highway, a traffic signal would be installed. Upon completion of the Project, improvements to Pearblossom Highway would provide for upgraded access and traffic flow within the area due to the proposed widening and intersection improvements.

All proposed roadway improvements, including the proposed signalized intersection, would be reviewed by the City of Palmdale as part of the development review process to ensure standard roadway engineering practices and design requirements, including site distance, are met. Proposed improvements to Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 would also require review and approval by Caltrans. The proposed improvements would be required to be designed and constructed in conformance with all applicable City design standards and Caltrans requirements specific to Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138. The Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses and impacts would be less than significant.

**d) *Result in inadequate emergency access?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Pearblossom Highway provides primary access to the Project site and would serve as the primary evacuation and emergency access route within the area. Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 and 47<sup>th</sup> Street East (designated as an evacuation route by the Palmdale General Plan) would also provide access to and out of the Project area. As discussed above, the Project proposes to widen Pearblossom Highway along the Project site's frontage to its ultimate half-width right-of-way from the Project site's westerly property line to the proposed travel center's easterly property line, which would also include installation of a traffic signal. During construction activities associated with the proposed on- and off-site improvements, traffic lanes located immediately adjacent to the Project site may be temporarily closed or controlled by construction personnel. However, this would be temporary and emergency access to the Project

site and surrounding area would be required to be maintained at all times. Additionally, all construction staging would occur within the boundaries of the Project site and would not interfere with circulation along Pearblossom Highway, Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138, or any other nearby roadways. Upon completion of the Project, improvements to Pearblossom Highway would provide for upgraded access and traffic flow within the area due to the proposed widening and intersection improvements. Pearblossom would continue to serve as a primary evacuation route within the area.

Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant would be required to submit appropriate plans for plan review to ensure compliance with zoning, building, and fire codes. The LACFD would review the Project for access requirements, minimum roadway widths, fire apparatus access roads, fire lanes, signage, access walkways, among other requirements to ensure adequate emergency access would be provided to and within the Project site. The Project would be required to comply with all applicable Building and Fire Code requirements and would submit construction plans to the Fire Department's Engineering Building Plan Check Unit for review and approval prior to issuance of any building permit. Approval by the Fire Department would ensure that Project construction and operation would not result in inadequate emergency access and impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**TRA-1:** Prior to issuance of building permits, the Project Applicant shall pay the fair share contribution toward optimizing the cycle length and signal timings, and providing an eastbound right-turn overlap phase for the Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 and Pearblossom Highway intersection.

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact                |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>XVIII TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>  |                                |   |                              |                          |
| Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:                             |                                |   |                              |                          |
| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                       | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) to Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                       | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

***Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:***

- a) ***Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?***
- b) ***A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) to Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?***

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** Assembly Bill (AB) 52 requires that lead agencies evaluate a project’s potential impact on “tribal cultural resources”, which include “[s]ites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are eligible for inclusion in the California Register

of Historical Resources or included in a local register of historical resources”. AB 52 also gives lead agencies the discretion to determine, based on substantial evidence, whether a resource qualifies as a “tribal cultural resource.” AB 52 applies whenever a lead agency adopts an environmental impact report, mitigated negative declaration, or negative declaration.

In compliance with AB 52, the City provided formal notification to those California Native American Tribal representatives requesting notification in accordance with AB 52. The SMBMI and FTBMI responded requesting consultation and incorporation of mitigation measures in the event cultural resources are discovered during project activities, including the requirement for SMBMI and FTBMI to be notified in the event of a discovery and the proper handling of resources if avoidance cannot be ensured; refer to Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2.

Based on the assessment conducted as part of the Cultural Resources Report, the archaeological sensitivity of the Project site is considered low. However, while highly unlikely, there is the potential for accidental discovery of archaeological resources during ground-disturbing activities, which could result in potential impacts. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 would require work in the immediate area to be halted if cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities and an archaeologist to be contacted to evaluate the find. Additionally, the SMBMI and FTBMI would be contacted so the Tribes can provide input with regards to significance and treatment of the find (Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and TCR-1) and all archaeological/cultural documents would be required to be provided to SMBMI and/or FTBMI (Mitigation Measure TCR-2). With implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 and Mitigation Measures TCR-1 and TCR-2, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 and impacts would be less than significant.

### **Mitigation Measures**

**TCR-1:** The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI) and Fernandño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians (FTBMI) shall be contacted, as detailed in CUL-1, of any pre-contact and/or post-contact historic-era cultural resources discovered during project implementation, and be provided information regarding the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment. Should the find be deemed significant, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), a cultural resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan shall be created by the archaeologist, in coordination with SMBMI and FTBMI, and all subsequent finds shall be subject to this Plan. This Plan shall allow for a monitor to be present that represents SMBMI and/or FTBMI for the remainder of the project, should SMBMI and/or FTBMI elect to place a monitor on-site.

**TCR-2:** Any and all archaeological/cultural documents created as a part of the project (isolate records, site records, survey reports, testing reports, etc.) shall be supplied to the applicant and Lead Agency for dissemination to SMBMI and/or FTBMI, to be

Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration  
Pilot Travel Center (Case No. TPM 83189, CUP 21-001, SPR 21-001)  
March 1, 2021  
Page 121

determined in consultation with the Tribes. The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with SMBMI and FTBMI on the disposition and treatment of any Tribal Cultural Resources encountered during all ground disturbing activities throughout the life of the project.

|   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>XIX UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b>  |                                |   |                                     |                          |
| Would the Project:  |                                |   |                                     |                          |
| a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Comply with federal, state and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Information in this section is based in part on the Pilot Travel Center City-Directed Sewer Area Study (Sewer Area Study) prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., dated January 11, 2021 and included in its entirety as Appendix H, Sewer Area Study.

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

- a) ***Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.**



### Water

The Project site is within the service area of Palmdale Water District (PWD). The Project site is comprised of a swap meet with limited water demand due to the nature of the site operations. Development of the proposed travel center site would require installation of water lines within the site and connection to an existing water main. The potential environmental effects associated with construction and operation of the Project, including the proposed water lines to serve the development are analyzed within this Initial Study and impacts have been determined to be less than significant with compliance with regulatory requirements and implementation of mitigation measures. Thus, the proposed Project would not require or result in relocation or construction of water facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Refer to Response XIX(b) regarding water supply.

### Wastewater and Wastewater Treatment

PSMD owns, maintains, and operates the City's Wastewater Collection System. The local PSMD system connects to the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts (District No. 20), which provides trunk lines to convey local wastewater for treatment. The wastewater generated by the proposed Project would be conveyed to the Palmdale Water Reclamation Plant (PAWRP) for treatment. The PAWRP provides primary, secondary, and tertiary treatment for a design capacity of 12 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater and has a current flow of 9.6 mgd.<sup>9</sup>

The Project site is comprised of an existing swap meet use with buildings/structures associated with the swap meet operations located within the eastern portion of the site and parking located within the western portion of the site. The Sewer Area Study estimates the proposed travel center would generate approximately 15,000 gallons per day (gpd) of wastewater requiring conveyance and treatment. Development of the travel center would require installation of sewer lines within the Project site and connection to an existing manhole. The potential environmental effects associated with construction and operation of the Project, including the proposed sewer line to serve the development are analyzed within this Initial Study and impacts have been determined to be less than significant with compliance with regulatory requirements and implementation of mitigation measures. Thus, the proposed Project would not require or result in relocation or construction of wastewater facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Refer to Response XIX(c) regarding wastewater treatment.

---

<sup>9</sup> Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts, Palmdale Water Reclamation Plant, [LACSD Web - Palmdale Water Reclamation Plant](#) and [LACSD Web - Who We Are & What We Do For You](#), accessed January 5, 2021.

### Stormwater Drainage

The proposed Pearblossom Highway roadway widening would require the extension of the existing box culvert located under Pearblossom Highway. As part of extending the culvert for the roadway widening, the Project proposes a drainage channel, which would convey water from the outfall of the existing culvert to the northwest corner of the parent parcel per the historical drainage pattern. The diversion channel and outlet would be designed so that runoff rates are reduced to that of existing conditions. Stormwater from the adjacent areas to the east and north of the proposed travel center site would continue to flow in a similar pattern as existing conditions and would confluence with the discharge from the drainage channel and continue to discharge to the northwest corner of the parent parcel. All runoff from the proposed travel center site would be directed to the proposed bioretention pond located within the northern portion of the site via sheet flow and underground via catch basin capture points. The catch basins and the concrete spillways at the pond would receive oil water separator inserts as a form of pretreatment for water quality. The potential environmental effects associated with construction and operation of the Project, including the proposed drainage facilities are analyzed within this Initial Study and impacts have been determined to be less than significant with compliance with regulatory requirements and implementation of mitigation measures. Thus, the proposed Project would not require or result in relocation or construction of stormwater drainage facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Refer to Response X(c) regarding drainage patterns and the Project's proposed hydrology and drainage.

### Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications

The Project site receives electrical power from Southern California Edison (SCE) and natural gas service from Southern California Gas (SoCalGas). Telecommunication services are provided by a variety of companies and are typically selected by the individual customer. Transmission lines/infrastructure for these services are provided within the Project area. The proposed travel center would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded electrical power facilities, natural gas facilities, or telecommunications facilities. The Project would connect to existing electrical, natural gas, and telecommunications infrastructure within the area. The potential environmental effects associated with the proposed travel center's energy demand are analyzed within this Initial Study and impacts have been determined to be less than significant. The proposed Project would not require or result in relocation or construction of electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

- b) ***Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project site is located within the PWD service area and would

connect to existing PWD water facilities to serve the proposed travel center. PWD's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) Tables 6-1, 6-2, and 6-3 shows that PWD projects adequate existing supplies to meet demands during normal years throughout the planning period.<sup>10</sup> However, PWD anticipates that during single-dry year conditions, demands will exceed existing supplies starting in 2020 and that during multiple-dry year conditions, demands will exceed existing supplies starting in 2030. Therefore, additional supplies are assumed to be needed to meet demands under those conditions.

According to the UWMP, PWD is developing the Palmdale Regional Groundwater Recharge and Recovery Project, which is anticipated to provide 7,500 acre-feet per year (AFY) up to potentially 10,800 AFY once the project is built-out through the recharge of recycled and imported water supplies, starting in 2020. In addition, the PWD has identified numerous short-and long-term transfer and exchange opportunities, which would provide additional supplies to help overcome supply shortages. Therefore, it is anticipated that existing supplies in combination with identified future and potential water supply opportunities will enable the PWD to meet all future water demands under all hydrologic conditions through the end of the planning period.

UWMP water demand forecasts are based on adopted General Plans. As discussed in Section XIV, Population and Housing, the Project proposes development of a travel center, which would involve the development of fueling facilities, travel amenities, restaurants, and parking facilities for passing motorists and commercial truck operators. Development of the site with the proposed commercial use would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation and zoning for the site. The Project's forecast population growth could increase the City's existing (2020) population of 156,737 persons by less than one-half of one percent (approximately 0.2 percent) to 156,987 persons. The Palmdale General Plan anticipated a population of 264,216 persons by 2010 and 441,280 persons at buildout of the City and sphere of influence under the uses permitted by the General Plan. Thus, the Project would be within the population projections anticipated and planned for by the City's General Plan and would not increase growth beyond what was anticipated in the UWMP. Sufficient water supplies would be available to serve the proposed travel center and impacts would be less than significant.

- c) ***Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** PSMD owns, maintains, and operates the City's Wastewater Collection System. The local PMSD system connects to the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts (District No. 20), which provides trunk lines to convey local wastewater for treatment. The wastewater generated by the proposed travel center would be conveyed to the Palmdale Water Reclamation Plant (PAWRP) for treatment. The PAWRP provides primary, secondary, and tertiary treatment for a design capacity of 12 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater and has a

---

<sup>10</sup> Kennedy/Jenks Consultants, 2015 Urban Water Management Plan for Palmdale Water District, June 2016.

current flow of 9.6 mgd.<sup>11</sup> According to the Sewer Area Study, the proposed travel center would have a wastewater flow of approximately 15,000 gallons per day requiring treatment. The PAWRP currently has available capacity to treat wastewater generated by the Project.

The design capacities of Districts' facilities are based on the regional growth forecast adopted by SCAG. Expansion of Districts' facilities must be sized and their service phased in a manner that is consistent with the SCAG regional growth forecast. Because SCAG growth projections are based in part on growth identified in local General Plans, growth associated with development of the Project site based on its General Plan land use designation has been anticipated by the growth forecasts. As discussed in Section XIV, Population and Housing, the Project's forecast population growth would increase the City's existing (2020) population of 156,737 persons by less than one-half of one percent (approximately 0.2 percent) to 156,987 persons, which is within the growth projections anticipated by the Palmdale General Plan. Further, the Districts have the authority to charge a fee for the privilege of connecting to the Districts' Sewage System for increasing the strength or quantity of wastewater discharged from connected facilities. The fee payment would be required before a permit to connect to the sewer is issued. Thus, adequate wastewater treatment would be available to serve the proposed Project and impacts would be less than significant.

- d) ***Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?***
- e) ***Comply with federal, state and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Solid waste collection services are provided by Waste Management, Inc. Waste from the City is disposed of at a number of solid waste facilities, with the majority of waste disposed at the Antelope Valley Public Landfill. The Project proposes the development of a travel center, which would include fueling facilities, travel amenities, restaurants, and parking facilities for passing motorists and commercial truck operators. State law requires a 65 percent diversion rate for construction and demolition projects. Thus, the Project would be required to achieve the diversion rate during construction activities associated with the Project. Project operations would increase solid waste disposal demands over existing conditions. As stated, solid waste within the City is primarily disposed of at the Antelope Valley Public Landfill. In 2019, approximately 95 percent of solid waste from Palmdale was disposed of at the Antelope Valley Public Landfill.<sup>12</sup> Antelope Valley Public Landfill has a maximum permitted throughput of 5,548 tons per day. The facility's maximum capacity is 30,200,000 cubic yards per day, with a

---

<sup>11</sup> Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts, Palmdale Water Reclamation Plant, [LACSD Web - Palmdale Water Reclamation Plant](#) and [LACSD Web - Who We Are & What We Do For You](#), accessed January 5, 2021.

<sup>12</sup> CalRecycle, Jurisdiction Disposal and Alternative Daily Cover (ADC) Tons by Facility, [Jurisdiction Disposal and Alternative Daily Cover \(ADC\) Tons by Facility \(ca.gov\)](#), accessed January 5, 2021.

remaining capacity of 17,911,225 cubic yards.<sup>13</sup> It is anticipated that Antelope Valley Public Landfill would continue to receive a majority of the solid waste from the City. Solid waste generated from the proposed travel center could be accommodated at the Antelope Valley Public Landfill.

The City has a per capita disposal rate target of 6.6 pounds per person per day. Since 2007, the City has met this target through its diversion programs with the most recent disposal rate (2019) of 4.1 pounds per person per day.<sup>14</sup> The City would continue to implement its diversion programs and require compliance with all federal, State and local statutes and regulations for solid waste, including those identified under the most current CALGreen standards and in compliance with AB 939. Thus, the proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts concerning solid waste.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

---

<sup>13</sup> CalRecycle, SWIS Facility/Site Activity Details, [SWIS Facility/Site Activity Details \(ca.gov\)](#), accessed January 5, 2021.

<sup>14</sup> CalRecycle, Jurisdiction Review Reports, Jurisdiction Per Capital Disposal Rate Trends (Post 2006), [Jurisdiction Review Reports \(ca.gov\)](#), accessed January 5, 2021.

|  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                |
|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>XX WILDFIRE</b><br>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:   |                                |   |                                     |                          |
| a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

**a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Fire Hazard Severity Zone maps produced by CalFire do not identify the Project site or surrounding area as being located within a State Responsibility Area (SRA) or lands classified as VHFHSZ.<sup>15</sup> CalFire identifies the area to the south of the Project site and Pearblossom Highway, within unincorporated Los Angeles County, as being located within a SRA and having moderate fire hazard potential.<sup>16</sup>

As discussed in Response IX(f), the City of Palmdale EOP outlines operations and procedures in the case of an emergency or disaster. Pearblossom Highway provides primary access to the Project site and would serve as the primary evacuation and emergency access route within the area. Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 and 47<sup>th</sup> Street East (designated as an evacuation route by

<sup>15</sup> CalFire, *Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA*, [Map of CAL FIRE’s Fire Hazard Severity Zones in Local Responsibility Areas – Palmdale](#), accessed July 30, 2020.

<sup>16</sup> CalFire, *Fire Hazard Severity Zones in SRA*, Adopted by CalFire on November 7, 2007, [Map of CAL FIRE’s Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Areas – Los Angeles County](#), accessed July 30, 2020.

the Palmdale General Plan) would also provide access to and out of the Project area. The Project proposes to widen Pearblossom Highway along the Project site's frontage to its ultimate half-width right-of-way from the Project's site's westerly property line to the proposed travel center's easterly property line, which would also include installation of a traffic signal. The proposed one-way access to the Project site from Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 would be provided by installing a right turn pocket along Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138. During construction activities associated with the proposed on- and off-site improvements, traffic lanes located immediately adjacent to the Project site may be temporarily closed or controlled by construction personnel. However, this would be temporary and emergency access to the Project site and surrounding area would be required to be maintained at all times. Additionally, all construction staging would occur within the boundaries of the Project site and would not interfere with circulation along Pearblossom Highway, Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138, or any other nearby roadways. Upon completion of the Project, improvements to Pearblossom Highway would provide for upgraded access and traffic flow within the area due to the proposed widening and intersection improvements. Pearblossom would continue to serve as a primary evacuation route within the area. Therefore, the Project does not include any characteristics or propose any changes to roads surrounding the Project that would physically impair or otherwise interfere with emergency response or evacuation plans in the Project vicinity; impacts would be less than significant.

**b) *Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As stated, the Project site is not located within an SRA or classified as a VHFHSZ. CalFire identifies the area to the south of the Project site and Pearblossom Highway, within unincorporated Los Angeles County, as being located within a SRA and having moderate fire hazard potential. The Project site and surrounding area are in a predominantly flat area within the City of Palmdale. The high desert, including the Project area experience occasional high wind conditions. The Project would be required to comply with federal, State, and local development regulations that minimize the risk of fire hazards. The Project site is primarily surrounded by development or transportation infrastructure. The proposed Project would not exacerbate wildfire risks exposing Project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire; impacts would be less than significant.

- c) ***Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As stated, the Project site is not located within an SRA or classified as a VHFHSZ. CalFire identifies the area to the south of the Project site and Pearblossom Highway, within unincorporated Los Angeles County, as being located within a SRA and having moderate fire hazard potential. The Project site is located adjacent to Pearblossom Highway and Fort Tejon Road/Highway 138 and is served by roadways within the area. The Project would not require the installation or maintenance of infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment; impacts would be less than significant.

- d) ***Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As discussed above, the Project site is not located within an SRA or classified as a VHFHSZ. CalFire identifies the area to the south of the Project site and Pearblossom Highway, within unincorporated Los Angeles County, as being located within a SRA and having moderate fire hazard potential. The Project site and surrounding area are in a relatively flat area of the City and would not be subject to downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.



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

### Discussion

The following are Mandatory Findings of Significance in accordance with Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines.

- a) ***Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?***

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** As discussed throughout this Initial Study, the Project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environmental or result in significant environmental impacts that cannot be reduced to a less than significant level with compliance with the established regulatory framework and implementation of mitigation measures.

As discussed in Section IV, Biological Resources, the Project would not substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. The Project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1 and BIO-2 to address the potential for burrowing owl and nesting migratory birds within the trees proposed to be removed as part of the Project, which would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

As discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources, the Project would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. As also concluded in Section V and Section XVIII, Tribal Cultural Resources, the Project is not anticipated to result in impacts to known cultural or tribal cultural resources. However, in the unlikely event that buried resources are encountered during ground disturbance activities, Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2, TCR-1 and TCR-2 would require work to be halted and an archaeologist to be contacted to evaluate the find in coordination with the SMBMI and develop and implement a Monitoring and Treatment Plan in the event avoidance cannot be ensured, which would reduce potential impacts to cultural and tribal cultural resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Project would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation.

- b) ***Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?***

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** Based on the analysis contained in this Initial Study, the proposed Project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts with implementation of Project mitigation measures. Compliance with the regulatory requirements and implementation of mitigation measures at the Project-level would reduce the potential for the incremental effects of the proposed Project to be considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, current projects, or probable future projects.

- c) ***Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?***

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** Previous sections of this Initial Study reviewed the proposed Project’s potential impacts to human beings related to several

environmental topical areas. As determined throughout this Initial Study, the proposed Project would not result in any potentially significant impacts that cannot be mitigated or reduced with compliance with the established regulatory requirements and implementation of mitigation measures by the City. The Project would not cause a substantial adverse effect on human beings, either directly or indirectly and impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** Refer to Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, CUL-1, CUL-2, CUL-3, GEO-1, NOI-1, NOI-2, TRA-1, TCR-1, and TCR-2.

Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration  
Pilot Travel Center (Case No. TPM 83189, CUP 21-001, SPR 21-001)  
March 1, 2021  
Page 134

This page intentionally left blank.

## 5. REFERENCES

Anza Resource Consultants, *Cultural Resources Survey for the Palmdale Pilot Travel Center Project, Palmdale, Los Angeles County, California*, January 2021.

Broadbent & Associates, Inc., *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment*, May 12, 2020.

Broadbent & Associates, Inc., *Asbestos Inspection Report*, August 12, 2020.

CalFire, *Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA*, [Map of CAL FIRE's Fire Hazard Severity Zones in Local Responsibility Areas – Palmdale](#), accessed July 30, 2020.

CalFire, *Fire Hazard Severity Zones in SRA*, Adopted by CalFire on November 7, 2007, [Map of CAL FIRE's Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Areas – Los Angeles County](#), accessed July 30, 2020.

California Department of Conservation, *California Important Farmland Finder*, [DLRP Important Farmland Finder \(ca.gov\)](#), accessed July 29, 2020.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife, *California Natural Diversity Database*, August 22, 2020.

CalRecycle, *Jurisdiction Disposal and Alternative Daily Cover (ADC) Tons by Facility*, [Jurisdiction Disposal and Alternative Daily Cover \(ADC\) Tons by Facility \(ca.gov\)](#), accessed January 5, 2021.

CalRecycle, *Jurisdiction Review Reports, Jurisdiction Per Capital Disposal Rate Trends (Post 2006)*, [Jurisdiction Review Reports \(ca.gov\)](#), accessed January 5, 2021.

CalRecycle, *SWIS Facility/Site Activity Details*, [SWIS Facility/Site Activity Details \(ca.gov\)](#), accessed January 5, 2021.

City of Palmdale, *Emergency Operations Plan*, 2012.

City of Palmdale, *Palmdale General Plan*, 1993.

City of Palmdale, *Palmdale Municipal Code*, current through Ordinance 1548, passed July 14, 2020.

De Novo Planning Group, *Air Toxics Health Risk Assessment*, January 2021.

Department of Toxic Substances Control, *Cortese List Data Resources*, [Cortese List Data Resources | CalEPA](#), accessed July 30, 2020.

Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration  
Pilot Travel Center (Case No. TPM 83189, CUP 21-001, SPR 21-001)  
March 1, 2021  
Page 136

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Insurance Rate Map, Map Number 06037C0700F, Effective Date September 26, 2008, [FEMA Flood Map Service Center | Search By Address](#), accessed January 5, 2021.

Geotechnical Solutions, Inc., *Geotechnical Engineering Percolation/Infiltration Test Report*, June 17, 2020.

Geotechnical Solutions, Inc., *Geotechnical Addendum Report*, June 17, 2020.

Geotechnical Solutions, Inc., *Geotechnical Evaluation Report*, June 17, 2020.

Kennedy/Jenks Consultants, *2015 Urban Water Management Plan for Palmdale Water District*, June 2016.

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., *Pilot Travel Center City-Directed Sewer Area Study*, January 11, 2021.

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., *Preliminary Hydrology & Hydraulics Report*, January 2021.

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., *Traffic Study for Pilot Travel Center*, January 2021.

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., *Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis*, January 2021.

Los Angeles County, Antelope Valley East Portion (sheet 2 of 3), Land Use Policy, May 26, 2015.

Los Angeles County, Antelope Valley East Portion (sheet 2 of 3), Zoning, May 26, 2015.

Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts, Palmdale Water Reclamation Plant, [LACSD Web - Palmdale Water Reclamation Plant](#) and [LACSD Web - Who We Are & What We Do For You](#), accessed January 5, 2021.

MD Acoustics, *Pilot Travel Palmdale Development Project Noise Impact Study*, January 2021.

PMC Consulting, *City of Palmdale Energy Action Plan*, August 3, 2011.

State of California, Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State – January 1, 2011-2020*, Sacramento, California, May 2020.