12.0 Comments and Responses
12.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

12.1 CEQA REQUIREMENTS

Before approving a project, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the Lead Agency to prepare and certify a Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

In accordance with Sections 15120 through 15132, and Section 15161 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City of Lancaster has prepared an EIR for the Downtown Lancaster Specific Plan (SCH #2007071114). The Response to Comments section, combined with the Draft EIR, comprise the Final EIR.

The following is an excerpt from the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15132, Contents of Final Environmental Impact Report:

The Final EIR shall consist of:

(a) The draft EIR or a version of the draft.

(b) Comments and recommendations received on the draft EIR either verbatim or in summary.

(c) A list of persons, organizations and public agencies commenting on the draft EIR.

(d) The responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process.

(e) Any other information added by the Lead Agency.

This Comments and Responses section includes all of the above-required components and shall be attached to the Draft EIR. The Final EIR will be a revised document that incorporates all of the changes made to the Draft EIR following the public review period.

12.2 PUBLIC REVIEW PROCESS – DRAFT EIR

The Draft EIR was circulated for review and comment to the public, agencies, and organizations. The Draft EIR was also circulated to State agencies for review through the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research. A notice of availability was placed in the Antelope Valley Press on May 30, 2008. The 45-day public review period ran from May 30, 2008 to July 14, 2008. Comments received during the 45-day public review period have been incorporated into this section.

During the public review period, local and State agencies submitted comments on the Draft EIR. During the public review period, six written comment letters on the Draft EIR were received. Additionally, verbal comments were received on the Draft EIR during the Planning Commission hearing of June 16, 2008.
12.3 FINAL EIR

The Final EIR allows the public and Lead Agency an opportunity to review revisions to the Draft EIR, the responses to comments, and other components of the EIR, such as the Mitigation Monitoring Program, prior to approval of the project. The Final EIR serves as the environmental document to support a decision on the proposed project.

After completing the Final EIR, and before approving the project, the Lead Agency must make the following three certifications, as required by Section 15090 of the CEQA Guidelines:

- The final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA;
- The final EIR was presented to the decision-making body of the lead agency, and that the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information contained in the final EIR prior to approving the project; and
- That the final EIR reflects the lead agency’s independent judgment and analysis.

Additionally, pursuant to Section 15093(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, when a Lead Agency approves a project that would result in significant, unavoidable impacts that are disclosed in the Final EIR, the agency must submit in writing its reasons for supporting the approved action. This Statement of Overriding Considerations is supported by substantial information in the record, which includes the Final EIR. Since the proposed project would result in significant, unavoidable impacts, the Lead Agency would be required to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations if it approves the proposed project.

These certifications, the Findings of Fact, and the Statement of Overriding Considerations are included in a separate Findings document.

12.4 WRITTEN COMMENT LETTERS AND RESPONSES

Written comments on the Draft EIR were received from the following:

A. Public Agencies

1. County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
2. Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
3. Native American Heritage Commission
4. Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District
5. California Regional Water Quality Control Board – Lahontan Region

All correspondence from those agencies/parties commenting on the Draft EIR is reproduced on the following pages. The individual comments on each letter have been consecutively numbered for ease of reference. Following each comment letter are responses to each numbered comment. A response is provided for each comment raising significant environmental issues. It should be noted that some comments provide information that does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR or provide new environmental information. The
comments are noted and will be forwarded to decision makers for their review and consideration.

Text changes to the Draft EIR may occur in response to comments received on the document. Added or modified text is underlined (example), while deleted text will have a strike out (example) through the text, and is included in a box, as the example below shows.

| Text from EIR | Text from EIR |

12.5 PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

In addition to written comments, verbal comments were received as part of the Planning Commission hearing on June 16, 2008. The transcript of the Planning Commission meeting is labeled as “Comment B.” Individual comments pertaining to the Draft EIR have been numbered and a response is provided for each comment raising significant environmental issues.
June 5, 2008

File No: 14-00.04-00

Ms. Brigitte Ligons
Planning Department
City of Lancaster
44933 North Fern Avenue
Lancaster, CA 93534-2461

Dear Ms. Ligons:

**Downtown Lancaster Specific Plan**

The County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (Districts) received a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the subject project on May 29, 2008. The proposed Specific Plan area is located within the jurisdictional boundaries of District No. 14. We offer the following comments regarding sewerage service:

1. **Page 5.7-12, Wastewater (Sewer), 1st paragraph, 4th sentence:** This sentence should be changed to read, “The trunk main network of District No. 14 consists of numerous trunk mains totaling approximately 64 miles of pipeline.”

2. **Page 5.7-12, Wastewater (Sewer), 5th paragraph, 3rd through 5th sentences:** These sentences should be replaced with the following: “Expansion of the plant is proposed to occur in three phases, referred to as Stage V Phase I, Stage V Phase II, and Stage VI Expansions. The Stage V Phase I and Phase II expansions will result in capacities of 18 and 21 mgd by 2011 and 2014, respectively. The Stage VI expansion is planned to achieve the 26 mgd capacity needed for the projected flows of 2020 by 2019.”

3. All other information concerning Districts’ facilities and sewerage service contained in the document is current.

If you have any questions, please contact the undersigned at (562) 908-4288, extension 2717.

Very truly yours,

Stephen R. Maguin

Ruth I. Frazen
Customer Service Specialist
Facilities Planning Department

A1.1 The comment provides revised text for the description of the trunk main network of District No. 14. The correction does not alter the impact conclusions identified in the Draft EIR. Paragraph 1 on Page 5.7-12 of the Draft EIR will be revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

Wastewater collected in the City of Lancaster initially flows through the local sewer pipelines owned by the City of Lancaster and currently maintained by the Los Angeles County Public Works Department Sewer Maintenance Division. Beginning July 1, 2008 the City of Lancaster will begin maintaining the local sewer system. At the locations of significant flow confluence, connection is made with the regional trunk sewers owned, operated and maintained by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County. The trunk main network of District No. 14 consists of numerous trunk mains and totaling approximately 64 miles of pipeline. Trunk sewer pipelines of 24-inches in diameter or smaller are usually constructed of vitrified clay pipe. Larger trunk sewers are typically constructed of reinforced concrete pipe. District No. 14 checks the capacity and physical condition of the pipeline biannually to determine if repairs or hydraulic relief is necessary.

A1.2 The comment provides revised and updated text for the description of expansion plans for the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant. The correction does not alter the impact conclusions identified in the Draft EIR. Paragraph 5 on Page 5.7-12 of the Draft EIR will be revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

In May 2004 the Sanitation Districts produced the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant 2020 Plan. The report indicates that the LWRP capacity needs to be expanded to 26.0 mgd to treat the estimated flows of 2020. Expansion of the plant is proposed to occur in three phases, referred to as Stage V Phase I, Stage V Phase II, and Stage VI Expansions. The Stage V Phase I and Phase II expansions will result in capacities of 18 and 21 mgd by 2011 and 2014, respectively, summer of 2008. The Stage VI expansion is planned to achieve the 26 mgd capacity needed for the projected flows of 2020 by 2019.

A1.3 The comment notes that other information concerning the Districts’ facilities and sewerage service contained in the Draft EIR is current. No further response is necessary.
Brigitte,

We have reviewed the Notice of Availability for the Downtown Lancaster Specific Plan DEIR and have the following comments:

On page 2-18, the DEIR accurately states "Development associated with the proposed project would create a demand for water that exceeds available supplies." While, the proposed mitigation measures include general descriptions of actions to reduce the project demand, they do not require that the project incorporate actions sufficient to reduce the project impacts such that there is a net zero increase in demand. The mitigation measures should include specific plans to:

1. Install all practicable best management practices to reduce the water demand of the project.
2. Utilize recycled water wherever possible to satisfy the project's water demand.
3. Convert existing potable water demand to recycled water as needed to achieve the net zero increase in demand.
A2. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM GREG EVEN, LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, DATED JUNE 9, 2008.

A2.1 The comment notes that the Draft EIR accurately states that the proposed project would create a demand for water that exceeds available supplies and recommends additional mitigation measures to reduce the project impacts such that there is a net zero increase in demand. The recommendations include: 1) Install all practicable best management practices to reduce the water demand of the project; 2) Utilize recycled water wherever possible to satisfy the project’s water demand; and 3) convert existing potable water demand to recycled water as needed to achieve the net zero increase in demand.

Section 5.7, Public Services and Utilities, of the Draft EIR identifies the thresholds of significance used to determine whether the proposed project would result in a significant impact to water supply. A significant impact would occur if the project has insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlement and resources, and new or expanded entitlement is needed. It should be noted that the thresholds of significance do not require the project achieve a net zero increase in water demand.

As indicated in Section 5.7, Public Services and Utilities, of the Draft EIR, The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LADPW) – Waterworks District No. 40 (District) is the water provider for Downtown Lancaster. The District conducted a water supply assessment (WSA) to determine if the District’s water system has sufficient projected water supplies to meet the projected demands of the proposed project. The WSA (November 2007) evaluates whether the projected water supply for normal, single-dry and multiple-dry water years would meet the project water demand in addition to the District’s existing and planned water uses, including any agricultural and manufacturing uses. If water supply is determined to be insufficient, the WSA is required to provide plans and measures that are being undertaken for acquiring and developing additional water supplies. As indicated in the WSA, the District’s existing water supplies are not sufficient to meet the demands associated with the proposed project in addition to the District’s existing and planned water uses. To meet demands associated with the proposed project during normal and dry years, new water supplies must be acquired and developed in the District’s service area. Although the District identified the State Water Project (SWP) as an opportunity to acquire new imported water, based on the Wanger court decision and the Department of Water Resources’ (DWR) Reliability Report (2007), the availability and reliability of the SWP water supply has been reduced and cannot be guaranteed. Therefore, it cannot be determined whether adequate water supply would be available to serve the proposed project, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact.

As individual projects are proposed within the Downtown Lancaster Specific Plan (DLSP) area, they would be required to verify that water supply is available to serve the proposed development. Additionally, future development projects would be required to reduce water demand to the maximum extent practicable. The Draft EIR identifies mitigation requiring that individual development projects incorporate water conservation measures into the design of the project. Such methods include using xeriscaping, low water-use turf, or a synthetic grass substitute in landscaped areas to minimize or eliminate the irrigation demand, and installation of weather-sensitive irrigation timers to ensure all landscaping receives only necessary amount of water.
Development within the DLSP would also be required to comply with Chapter 13.24 of the City’s Municipal Code. In early 2005, the City adopted a recycled water use ordinance (Ordinance No. 841), adding Chapter 13.24 to the City’s Municipal Code. The City’s Recycled Water Facilities and Operations Master Plan provides the baseline to define the Recycled Water Service Areas and Mandatory Recycled Water Use Area identified in the ordinance. The recommended Recycled Water Service Areas consist of all potential recycled water urban uses including golf courses and cemeteries irrigation, freeway landscaping, park/playground and school yard irrigation, landscaping in new development areas, toilet flushing in public buildings and new commercial developments, construction water, industrial or commercial cooling or air conditioning, decorative fountains, commercial laundry, and automatic car washes. The Master Plan identifies the recommended Mandatory Recycled Water Use areas, which includes the DLSP area. The Mandatory Recycled Water Use Area mandates construction of recycled water distribution systems or other facilities in new and existing developments for current or future recycled water use as a condition of any development approval or continued water service if future water recycling facilities are proposed in the Master Plan that could adequately serve the development.
Ms. Brigette Ligons
CITY OF LANCASTER
44933 Fern Avenue
Lancaster, CA 93534

Re: SCH#2007071114, CEQA Notice of Completion; Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Downtown Lancaster Specific Plan; City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California

Dear Ms. Ligons:

The Native American Heritage Commission is the state agency designated to protect California's Native American Cultural Resources. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, that includes archaeological resources, is a 'significant effect' requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) per the California Code of Regulations §15064.5(b)(c) (CEQA guidelines). Section 15382 of the 2007 CEQA Guidelines defines a significant impact on the environment as "a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of physical conditions within an area affected by the proposed project, including ... objects of historic or aesthetic significance." In order to comply with this provision, the lead agency is required to assess whether the project will have an adverse impact on these resources within the 'area of potential effect (APE)', and if so, to mitigate that effect. To adequately assess the project-related impacts on historical resources, the Commission recommends the following action:

- Contact the appropriate California Historic Resources Information Center (CHRIS) for possible 'recorded sites' in locations where the development will or might occur. Contact information for the Information Center nearest you is available from the State Office of Historic Preservation (916/653-7278) http://www.ohp.parks.ca.gov. The record search will determine:
  - If a part or the entire APE has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
  - If any known cultural resources have already been recorded in or adjacent to the APE.
  - If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
  - If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.

- If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
  - The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure.
  - The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional archaeological information Center.

- Contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for:
  - A Sacred Lands File (SLF) search of the project area and information on tribal contacts in the project vicinity that may have additional cultural resource information. Please provide this office with the following citation format to assist with the Sacred Lands File search request: USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle citation with name, township, range and section.
  - The NAHC advises the use of Native American Monitors, when profession archaeologists or the equivalent are employed by project proponents, in order to ensure proper identification and care given cultural resources that may be discovered. The NAHC recommends that contact be made with Native American Contacts on the attached list to get their input on potential project impact (APE). In some cases, the existence of a Native American cultural resources may be known only to a local tribe(s).

- Lack of surface evidence of archaeological resources does not preclude their subsurface existence.
  - Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archaeological resources, per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) §15064.5 (f).
  - In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American, with knowledge in cultural resources, should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.
  - A culturally-affiliated Native American tribe may be the only source of information about a Sacred Site/Native American cultural resource.
  - Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the disposition of recovered artifacts, in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.
Lead agencies should include provisions for discovery of Native American human remains or unmarked cemeteries in their mitigation plans.

- CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(d) requires the lead agency to work with the Native Americans identified by this Commission if the initial Study identifies the presence or likely presence of Native American human remains within the APE. CEQA Guidelines provide for agreements with Native American, identified by the NAHC, to assure the appropriate and dignified treatment of Native American human remains and any associated grave items.

- Health and Safety Code §7050.5, Public Resources Code §5097.98 and Sec. §15064.5 (d) of the California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines) mandate procedures to be followed, including that construction or excavation be stopped in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery until the county coroner or medical examiner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. Note that §7052 of the Health & Safety Code states that disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony.

- Lead agencies should consider avoidance, as defined in §15370 of the California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines), when significant cultural resources are discovered during the course of project planning and implementation.

Please feel free to contact me at (916) 653-6251 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Dave Singleton
Program Analyst

Attachment: List of Native American Contacts

Cc: State Clearinghouse
Native American Contacts
 Los Angeles County
 June 9, 2008

Charles Cooke
32835 Santiago Road
Acton, CA 93510
(661) 733-1812 - cell
suscol@intox.net

Randy Guzman - Folkes
Chumash
1931 Shadybrook Drive
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362
ndnrandy@hotmail.com
(805) 905-1675 - cell
Chumash
Fernandeño
Tataviam
Shoshone Paiute
Yaqui

Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians
William Gonzales, Cultural/Environ Dept.
601 South Brand Boulevard, Suite 102
San Fernando, CA 91340
ced@tataviam.org
(818) 837-0794 Office
(818) 581-9293 Cell
(818) 837-0796 Fax

LA City/County Native American Indian Comm
Ron Andrade, Director
3175 West 6th Street, Rm. 403
Los Angeles, CA 90020
(213) 351-5324
(213) 386-3895 FAX

San Fernando Band of Mission Indians
John Valenzuela, Chairperson
P.O. Box 221838
Newhall, CA 91322
tsen2u@msn.com
(661) 753-9833 Office
(760) 885-0955 Cell
(760) 949-1604 Fax

Fernandeño
Tataviam
Serrano
Vanyume
Kitanemuk

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.99 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the propose SCH#2007071114; CEQA Notice of Completion; draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Downtown Lancaster Specific Plan; City of Lancaster; Los Angeles County, California.
A3. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM DAVE SINGLETON, NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION, DATED JUNE 9, 2008.

A3.1 As indicated in Section 5.8, Cultural Resources, of the Draft EIR, CRM TECH conducted a historical resources record search, historical background research, and field survey for the project area. Additionally, on July 9, 2007, a written request was submitted to the State of California's Native American Heritage Commission for a records search in the commission's sacred lands file. In response to CRM TECH's inquiry, the Native American Heritage Commission reported that the sacred lands record search identified no Native American cultural resources within the planning area. However, because “the absence of specific site information in the Sacred Lands File does not guarantee the absence of cultural resources in any ‘area of potential effect,’” the commission suggested that local Native American representatives be contacted, and provided a list of potential contacts in the region. Following the commission's recommendations, on July 13, 2007, CRM TECH contacted nine local Native American representatives in writing to solicit their input regarding possible cultural resources concerns regarding the Downtown Lancaster Specific Plan (DLSP). Among those contacted were the Los Angeles City/County Native American Indian Commission, spokespersons for the nearest recognized tribal organizations, and local Native American cultural representatives of Kitanemuk heritage, whose ancestors traditionally occupied the Lancaster area. To date, no responses have been received from the local Native American representatives contacted.

In addition to the above, the City initiated consultation with local Native American Tribes pursuant to SB 18. On July 18, 2007, a request for the Local Government Tribal Consultation list was made to the Native American Heritage Commission. Upon receiving the list of contacts, the City requested SB 18 Consultation with four local tribes. To date, no responses have been received from the local Native American representatives contacted.

As noted in the Draft EIR, it is not anticipated that archaeological or paleontological resources exist within the project area. However, the potential exists that erosional or depositional processes, along with other impacts, have obscured archaeological and paleontological resources that may be present. Mitigation has been identified that in the event resources are discovered, work would be stopped and a qualified archaeologist would be contacted.

As also noted in Section 10.0, Effects Found Not to be Significant, of the Draft EIR, the project site is predominately urbanized with land area having been previously disturbed. No known human remains exist on-site, and due to the level of past disturbance, it is not anticipated that human remains exist within the project site. However, in the event human remains are encountered during earth removal or disturbance activities, all activities would cease immediately and a qualified archaeologist and Native American monitor would be immediately contacted. The Coroner would be contacted pursuant to Sections 5097.98 and 5097.99 of the Public Resources Code relative to Native American remains. Should the Coroner determine the human remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission would be contacted pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.
June 17, 2008

Ms. Brigitte Ligons
City of Lancaster, Planning Department
44933 North Fern Avenue
Lancaster, CA 93534

Project: Downtown Lancaster Specific Plan

Dear Ms. Ligons:

The Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (District) has reviewed the May 2008 Public Review Draft Downtown Lancaster Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report. The Downtown Lancaster Specific Plan (DLSP) provides area-specific land use regulations and development guidelines for seven districts within the Downtown. Development of the DLSP would allow for a mix of land uses including retail, office, residential and civic uses within the seven districts.

The District concurs with the analysis and findings for Air Quality in the Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project. The District would also like to note that it considers many of the Traffic, Circulation and Parking Mitigation Measures to have an air quality benefit. The District supports mixed use development initiative; such development is expected to produce cumulative and regional environmental benefits.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this planning document. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at (760) 245-1661, extension 6726, or Tracy Walters at extension 6122.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Alan J. De Salvio
Supervising Air Quality Engineer

TW/AJD

DLSP
A4. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM ALAN J. DE SALVIO, MOJAVE DESERT AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, DATED JUNE 17, 2008.

A4.1 The comment notes the District’s concurrence with the air quality analysis and findings for the proposed project. Additionally, the District notes that many of the traffic, circulation, and parking mitigation measures would have an air quality benefit and that the District supports mixed use development. No further response is necessary.
July 7, 2008

Brigitte Ligons, Planning Department  
City of Lancaster  
44933 Fern Avenue  
Lancaster, CA 93534  
Fax (661) 723-5926

COMMENTS ON THE NOTICE OF COMPLETION AND CONSULTATION PROCESS ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, DOWNTOWN LANCASTER SPECIFIC PLAN, STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2007071114

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region (Water Board) staff has reviewed the Notice of Completion and Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) document dated May 21, 2008, for the above-referenced project. Please refer to the items checked for staff comments regarding our review:

[ ] The site plan for this project does not specifically identify features for the post-construction period that will control storm water on-site or prevent pollutants from non-point sources from entering and degrading surface or groundwaters. The foremost method of reducing impacts to watersheds from urban development is “Low Impact Development” (LID), the goals of which are maintaining a landscape functionally equivalent to predevelopment hydrologic conditions and minimal generation of non-point source pollutants. LID results in less surface runoff and potentially less impacts to receiving waters, the principles of which include:

- Maintaining natural drainage paths and landscape features to slow and filter runoff and maximize groundwater recharge;
- Reducing the impervious cover created by development and the associated transportation network; and,
- Managing runoff as close to the source as possible.

We understand that LID development practices that would maintain aquatic values could also reduce local infrastructure requirements and maintenance costs, and could benefit air quality, open space, and habitat. Planning tools to implement the above principles and manuals are available to provide specific guidance regarding LID.

We request you require these principles to be incorporated into the proposed project design. We request natural drainage patterns be maintained to the extent feasible.
Future development plans should consider the following items:

[X] If the project involves land disturbance of more than 1.0 acre in area or is part of a larger plan of common development, then the project requires development of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, and

[X] a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Storm Water Permit, and/or
[X] a NPDES General Industrial Storm Water Permit.

These permits can be accessed through the State Water Resources Control Board’s web site (www.waterboards.ca.gov).

Best Management Practices (BMPs) are used to reduce pollutants in runoff to waters of the State. The environmental document must specifically describe BMPs and their role in mitigation of project impacts.

[X] The project may require a Federal Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Board. Application forms can be downloaded from the Regional Board’s web site (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/).

[X] The environmental document does not provide specific information on how impacts to surface waters of the State and/or waters of the U.S. will be mitigated. These surface waters include, but are not limited to, drainages, streams, washes, ponds, pools, or wetlands. Waters of the State or waters of the U.S. may be permanent or intermittent. Waters of the State may include waters determined to be isolated or otherwise non-jurisdictional by the Army Corps of Engineers. The environmental document needs to quantify these impacts and discuss purpose of project, need for surface water disturbance, and alternatives (avoidance, minimize disturbances, and mitigation). Mitigation must be identified in the environmental document including timing of construction.

Mitigation must replace functions and values of wetlands lost. For more information see the Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region (Basin Plan), which can be accessed via the Regional Board’s web site (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/references.shtml).

[X] Other

- Please include both pre-construction and post-construction storm water management and BMPs as part of the planning process.

- Please consider designs that minimize impervious surfaces, such as permeable surface parking areas, directing runoff onto vegetated areas using curb cuts and rock swales, etc., and infiltrating runoff as close to the source as possible to avoid forming erosion channels. Design features should be incorporated to ensure that runoff is not concentrated by the proposed project. The project must incorporate measures to
ensure that storm water generated by the project is managed on-site both pre-and post-construction. Please show on plan drawings the on-site storm water control measures.

- If the proposed project is located in an area that contains drainages, wetlands, waters of the State, waters of the U.S. or blue-line stream, we request that measures be incorporated into the project to avoid these areas and provide buffer zones where possible. The project proponent must consult with the Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of Fish and Game, and the Water Board prior to issuing a grading permit.

- Please consider development features that span drainage channels or allow for broad crossings. Design features of future development should be incorporated to ensure that runoff is not concentrated by the proposed project, thereby causing downstream erosion.

- If the proposed project impacts and alters drainages, then we request that the project be designed such that it would maintain existing drainage features and patterns to the extend feasible. The project proponent must consult with the Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of Fish and Game, and the Water Board prior to issuing a grading permit.

- We request the project be re-circulated for review and comment should the domestic wastewater disposal system method be changed.

Please note that obtaining a permit and conducting monitoring does not constitute adequate mitigation. Development and implementation of acceptable mitigation is required. The environmental document must specifically describe the BMPs and other mitigation measures used to mitigate project impacts.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (760) 241-7376, or by email at jzimmerman@waterboards.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Jan M. Zimmerman, PG
Engineering Geologist

cc: State Clearinghouse
A5. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM JAN M. ZIMMERMAN, CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD – LAHONTAN REGION, DATED JULY 7, 2008.

A5.1 The commenter requests that Low Impact Development (LID) principles be incorporated into the proposed project design to reduce impacts to watersheds from urban development. The Downtown Lancaster Specific Plan (DLSP) serves as a planning and regulatory link between the City of Lancaster General Plan and individual, project level development within the DLSP area. The DLSP provides area-specific land use regulations and development guidelines for seven districts within the Downtown. Specific development proposals have not been submitted, therefore, the Draft EIR provides a programmatic level of analysis. Section 5.10, Hydrology, Drainage, and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR, analyzes potential project impacts on existing drainage patterns, surface hydrology and flood control facilities and water quality conditions in the project area. As indicated in the Draft EIR, the project area is currently developed with civic, cultural, commercial, office, residential and associated parking uses. The proposed project would slightly increase impervious areas within the project area. The drainage paths for the proposed condition would be the same as for existing conditions. Existing drainage is primarily in the streets. The project site and tributary area generally drains to the intersection of Lancaster Boulevard and 10th Street West.

The project area is greater than 1.0 acre, and as noted in the Draft EIR, the proposed project would be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program, which controls water pollution by regulating point sources that discharge pollutants into waters of the United States. Mitigation measures in the Draft EIR require that future applicants prepare and submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the California State Water Resources Control Board, providing notification and intent to comply with the State of California General Permit by future Applicants and that future development projects within the DLSP area shall conform to the requirements of an approved Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and the NPDES Permit for General Construction Activities, including implementation of all recommended BMPs. The SWPPP shall outline the source control and/or treatment control BMPs to avoid or mitigate runoff pollutants at the construction site to the maximum extent practicable.

Operation of the proposed project could impact pollutant loading immediately offsite. The Draft EIR includes mitigation measures to ensure the use of BMPs to reduce long-term water quality impacts to a less than significant level. Potential BMPs may include loading and unloading areas, vehicle and equipment washing, parking areas, street cleaning, vegetation controls, and trash storage areas. Future development of the project area would require a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to conform to the City’s Storm Water Management Plan and NPDES permit.

A5.2 Refer to Response to Comment A5.1.

A5.3 The comment notes that the proposed project may require a Federal Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Board and where the form can be downloaded. The comment is noted. No further response is necessary.

A5.4 Refer to Response to Comment A5.1. As indicated in Section 5.10, Hydrology, Drainage, and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR, the proposed DLSP project would result
in a slight increase in the amount of impervious areas on site. The proposed conditions investigated include changes to land use, changes to drainage patterns, assumed storm drain configuration, hydrology, floodplain mapping, and surface water quality. Proposed project hydrology (based on assumed flow paths and storm drain locations) was completed to determine the impacts that the new development would have on storm runoff. The project site and tributary area generally drains to the intersection of Avenue I and 10th Street West and Lancaster Boulevard and 10th Street West. The drainage paths for the proposed condition would be the same as for existing conditions. Although the majority of the flows would be contained in the streets, potential hydraulic impacts are considered significant and would require mitigation. The Draft EIR identifies mitigation measures to ensure that adequate capacity in the storm drain exists prior to development. City of Lancaster decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project.

A5.5 Comment noted. Refer to Response to Comment A5.1. The DLSP serves as a planning and regulatory link between the City of Lancaster General Plan and individual, project level development within the DLSP area. There are no specific development proposals at this time. Project implementation would involve numerous developments/improvement projects throughout the area. Future development activities occurring within the DLSP area would be assessed individually and subsequent drainage improvements and programmatic/project WQMPs would be developed to ensure compliance with the Regional Water Quality Control Board and Clean Water Act requirements. City of Lancaster decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project.
July 9, 2008

Brigitte Ligons
City of Lancaster
44933 N. Fern Avenue
Lancaster, CA 93534

Dear Ms. Ligons:

Re: SCH# 200707114; Downtown Lancaster Specific Plan

The California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) has jurisdiction over the safety of highway-rail crossings (crossings) in California. The California Public Utilities Code requires Commission approval for the construction or alteration of crossings and grants the Commission exclusive power on the design, alteration, and closure of crossings.

The Commission’s Rail Crossings Engineering Section (RCES) is in receipt of the Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal-DEIR from the State Clearinghouse. The mitigation measure for the proposed development project for the two-lane Lancaster Boulevard option at Lancaster Boulevard, 10th Street West and Sierra Highway (lat=34.696214, long=-118.141351) mentions “narrowing Lancaster Boulevard from a four-lane to a two-lane road is intended to prioritize walking, bicycling and other modes of transit in the Downtown Lancaster Specific Plan area.” The Lancaster Boulevard (DOT# 750609H) crossing appears to fall within this option.

Modifications to existing crossings are within the scope of Commission General Order (GO) 88-B: “Rules for Altering Public Highway-Rail Crossings.” A request for authorization must be submitted to the Commission through RCES. One of the primary prerequisites for a GO 88-B application is concurrence of all parties (railroad, local agency and Commission) to the proposed changes. The City should arrange a meeting with RCES staff to discuss relevant safety issues and requirements of a GO88-B request for authority to modify a crossing when ready to proceed.

If you have any questions, please contact Laurence Michael, Utilities Engineer at 213-576-7076, ldi@cpuc.ca.gov, or me at rxm@cpuc.ca.gov, 213-576-7078.

Sincerely,

Rosa Muñoz, PE
Utilities Engineer
Rail Crossings Engineering Section
Consumer Protection & Safety Division

C: Dan Miller, UP
   Elizabeth Mahoney, SCRR
A6. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM ROSA MUNOZ, PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, DATED JULY 9, 2008.

A6.1 The comment notes that the proposed two-lane Lancaster Boulevard option between 10th Street West and Sierra Highway may affect the Lancaster Boulevard rail crossing. Further, any modifications to existing crossings are within the scope of Commission General Order (GO) 88-B: “Rules for Altering Public Highway-Rail Crossings”. The comment recommends the City arrange a meeting with the Commission’s Rail Crossing Engineering Section to discuss relevant safety issues and requirements of a GO88-B request for authority to modify a crossing when the City is ready to proceed. Prior to any modifications to the rail crossing, City staff will contact the Commission’s Rail Crossing Engineering Section for consultation. No further response is necessary.
Transcript of Agenda Item No. 10 – Comment on the Downtown Lancaster Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report
Planning Commission Meeting June 16, 2008, 7 p.m.

Chairman Vose: The next item is new business. Under new business we have the Downtown Lancaster Draft Specific Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report. So we are here tonight to open the public hearing for the 45-day review period which began May 30, 2008 and will end July 14, 2008. The public hearing is open. Staff care to make comments on that, Brian?

Mr. Ludicke: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just briefly this is as you indicated the environmental document for the Draft Downtown Specific Plan. Really at this point in the process, we are inviting from the public any oral or written comments that they would like to make regarding the adequacy of that Draft EIR. The actual review of the Draft Specific Plan can also be done by the public. I would like to note for the record, that it is available via the City’s website. They can download that and look at it. I think that it would be worthwhile for anyone who’s interested in the future of the downtown area to take a look at that document. We feel that its form-based codes as proposed and the work that went into it from various community members over the last couple of years will ultimately result in some very good things for our downtown.

Chairman Vose: Very good, thank you. We have no speakers identified? Since this is a public hearing, anyone can speak on this matter it is an environmental document that we will be happy to take your testimony, if anybody has any? Hearing none, we will
close the public hearing and Commissioners do you have any comments you want to make before we? I seem to be making all the comments here. On page 2-6 of the Executive Summary, on 2-5 you talk about a project with a four-lane Lancaster Boulevard and then on 2-6 you talk about an alternate with a two-lane Lancaster Boulevard and then there are some modifications and some left and right turn modifications of various intersecting streets and so forth. So if you are looking for comments, I see the justification for the two-lane Lancaster Boulevard. I suggest that some folks maybe take a look at other communities in southern California where they’ve done such a thing and how it tends to back traffic up into the downtown shopping area, impacts the parking and Burbank comes to mind. And the issue as it relates to potential hotspots where vehicles will sit for long periods of time, idle and burn fuel and create hotspots. So if I had my druthers which you know, I may, I think the four-lane is probably more appropriate but there is certainly a benefit to two-lanes with bike lanes and more pedestrian access as well, so I just think it ought to be talked about.

On item 2-11 this is my comments are all on the Executive Summary, AQ-4, I would suggest that you add the designation that the project liaison phone number be available 24/7. It’s been my experience with construction projects particularly those that have dust problems that it’s often very difficult to contact the folks responsible to water their projects on Saturday or Sunday or holidays. Usually the 3 and 4 day weekend, we tend to get high winds and no way to get water trucks out and that sort of thing. So that’s on this and I would suggest that on any development for that matter. The project liaison again is identified on 213, 2-13 as well.
There is one more on page 2-17 we talk about fire protection, schools and libraries and parks and rec and water and all the utilities. Find it odd that there are no comments and no mitigation measures discussed under police protection with the increase of commercial development and square footage and more pedestrians and more people and more housing if it impacts fire protection, I would imagine it will impact police protection certainly at very least bike patrols. So maybe we, maybe there should be some review of that. And that's all I have.

So if the motion is in order so we have a motion to close the public hearing? Did we?

Yes, we did, so we do not have to do anything further, is that correct?

Mr. Ludicke: Yes, that would be your only action, there's no, there's no decision required on this.

Chairman Vose: Alright.
B. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 16, 2008

B1. Chairman Vose notes that the project includes the potential for a two-lane Lancaster Boulevard and suggests looking at other communities where the same has occurred in terms of how traffic backs up into the downtown shopping area and potential hotspots. Chairman Vose identifies the four-lane option as more appropriate, but acknowledges the benefits of two lanes. He suggests that the options be discussed. The comment does not raise new environmental information or directly challenge information provided in the Draft EIR. It should be noted that Section 5.3, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking, of the Draft EIR analyzes impacts on local roadways and intersections, as well as regional transportation facilities, and parking within the area. The traffic analysis evaluates the 4-lane Lancaster Boulevard and 2-Lane Lancaster Boulevard scenarios. Impacts related to traffic and parking resulting from implementation of the proposed project are either less than significant or are reduced to less than significant levels with the imposition of mitigation measures with the exception of three intersections for Forecast Year 2030 With Project With Four-Lane Lancaster Boulevard conditions and four intersections for Forecast Year 2030 With Project With Two-Lane Lancaster Boulevard conditions. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for both Lancaster Boulevard scenarios.

Section 5.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR evaluates the potential impacts of carbon monoxide hotspots resulting from implementation of the proposed project. To identify CO hotspots, the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) follows the South Coast Air Quality Management District criterion, which requires a CO microscale hotspot analysis when a project increases the volume-to-capacity ratio (also called the intersection capacity utilization) by 0.02 (two percent) for any intersection with an existing level of service (LOS) D or worse. As indicated in Table 5.4-8, Project Buildout Carbon Monoxide Concentrations, of the Draft EIR, CO levels would be well below the State standard of 20 ppm for the 1-hour Standards and 9 ppm for the 8-hour standards. Therefore impacts associated with CO levels would be less than significant.

B2. The comment recommends that a designation be added that the project liaison phone number be available 24 hours a day/7 days a week during construction activities. The name and phone number of the liaison would be required to be posted at any construction site within the DLSP area at all times. The posting with the contact information would remain for the duration of construction activities.

B3. The comment is in regards to police protection services and the lack of mitigation measures in comparison to fire protection services. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LACSD), Lancaster Station was contacted regarding the proposed project. According to the LACSD, implementation of the proposed project would not have a significant impact on law enforcement services, and therefore would not require the implementation of mitigation measures. Although the project would involve an increase in commercial, residential, and civic uses that may increase calls for service and may require additional staffing, development of the Downtown Lancaster Specific Plan would occur in phases over several years, and therefore the LACSD anticipates that any increased demand for law enforcement and traffic services would be coordinated between LACSD and the City, resulting in a less than significant impact.
12.6 ERRATA

12.6.1 FORMAT OF TEXT CHANGES

Text changes to the Draft EIR for the Final EIR are intended to clarify or correct information in the Draft EIR in response to comments received on the document, or as initiated by the Lead Agency staff. Revisions to the Draft EIR are shown as excerpts from the Draft EIR text. Added or modified text is underlined (example), while deleted text will have a strike out (example) through the text.

12.6.2 TEXT CHANGES

The following pages from the Draft EIR have resulted in text changes for the Final EIR. Changes were made in the following sections:

- Section 2.0, Executive Summary
- Section 5.7, Public Services and Utilities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks and Recreation</strong></td>
<td>PSU-65 Prior to issuance of building permits, project applicants shall pay the required Parks Development Fee and Park Acquisition Fee in place at time of payment to the City of Lancaster.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development associated with the proposed project would result in an increased demand for park and recreation facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
<td>PSU-75 For each site-specific development, prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicants shall pay all applicable developer fees described in the adopted Rules and Regulations, Part 4, for the Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40, (i.e., groundwater supply fee, groundwater bank, additional wells, additional treatment capacity/facilities, recycled water fee, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development associated with the proposed project would create demand for water that exceeds available supplies.</td>
<td>PSU-87 Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall obtain verification from District 40 confirming that adequate water supply and water systems would be available to adequately serve the project in which building permits are being issued.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wastewater</strong></td>
<td>PSU-40 For each site-specific development, prior to the issuance of a Permit to Connect, the Developer shall pay the required connection fees to the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles. PSU-41 For each site-specific development, prior to issuance of building permits, the Developer shall provide evidence that the County Sanitation Districts of Los</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the proposed project would generate wastewater that could exceed the capacity of conveyance and treatment facilities that serve the project area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angeles has sufficient wastewater transmission and treatment plant</td>
<td>PSA-12 For each site-specific development, prior to the issuance of building permits,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacity to accept sewage flows from the buildings for which building</td>
<td>the Developer shall provide engineering studies to the City of Lancaster’s Public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permits are being requested.</td>
<td>Works Department verifying that the sewer system has adequate capacity to serve the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project. If additional improvements are required, the applicant shall pay the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>necessary fees required for the sewer system improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricities</td>
<td>PSA-13 If, during site-specific development, impacts to SCE facilities or land related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development associated with the proposed project would result in an</td>
<td>rights occur, the impacts to these resources shall be addressed and agreed upon by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increased demand for electricity services.</td>
<td>the City, project applicant and SCE prior to finalizing the development plan and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>issuance of building permits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>No mitigation measures are required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development associated with the proposed project would result in an</td>
<td>Conditional. Development associated with buildout of the proposed project would</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increased demand for natural gas services.</td>
<td>generate solid waste that would incrementally decrease the capacity and lifespan of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>landfills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>PSA-14 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicants shall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development associated with buildout of the proposed project would</td>
<td>develop a Solid Waste Program to encourage recycling. The program shall include</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generate solid waste that would incrementally decrease the capacity</td>
<td>provisions to provide bins for recyclable materials (i.e., paper, cardboard,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and lifespan of landfills.</td>
<td>beverage containers, etc.) on site. The project applicants shall be responsible for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implementing the program after construction is complete.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSA-15 The project applicants shall comply with all applicable City, County, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State regulations and procedures for the use, collection, and disposal of solid and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hazardous wastes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WASTEWATER (SEWER)

Wastewater collected in the City of Lancaster initially flows through the local sewer pipelines owned by the City of Lancaster and currently maintained by the Los Angeles County Public Works Department Sewer Maintenance Division. Beginning July 1, 2008 the City of Lancaster will begin maintaining the local sewer system. At the locations of significant flow confluence, connection is made with the regional trunk sewers owned, operated and maintained by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County. The trunk main network of District No. 14 consists of numerous trunk mains and totaling approximately 64 miles of pipeline. Trunk sewer pipelines of 24-inches in diameter or smaller are usually constructed of vitrified clay pipe. Larger trunk sewers are typically constructed of reinforced concrete pipe. District No. 14 checks the capacity and physical condition of the pipeline biannually to determine if repairs or hydraulic relief is necessary.

Wastewater discharge in the project area is directed to local sewer lines, which are not maintained by the Sanitation Districts. Wastewater is conveyed to both the Sanitation Districts' Fern Avenue Trunk Sewer and the Avenue I Trunk Sewer. The 10-inch Fern Avenue Trunk Sewer is located in Fern Avenue from Jackman Street to Lancaster Boulevard with the design capacity of 1.1 million gallons per day (mgd) and a recorded peak flow of 0.4 mgd in 2006. The 12-inch Avenue I Trunk Sewer is located in Avenue I from Sierra Highway to Elm Street with the design capacity of 1.3 mgd and a recorded peak flow of 0.6 mgd in 2006.5

Table 5.7-5, Existing Wastewater Flow, summarizes the estimated wastewater flow from existing uses within the DLSP area. As indicated in Table 5.7-5, average daily wastewater flow is 140,261 gallons per day (gpd) and peak wastewater flow is approximately 244 gallons per minute (gpm) within the project area.

Flow from the project area is conveyed to the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant (LWRP), located near Avenue D and east of 20th Street West. The plant is located on 553 acres and includes four effluent storage ponds and the Antelope Valley Tertiary Treatment Plant (AVTTP). Approximately, 0.5 mgd of the LWRP’s overall effluent is tertiary treated for use as recycled water by the AVTTP. By spring of 2008, the tertiary treatment at the LWRP will be increased to 1.5 mgd upon the completion of a Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) at the plant. The present permitted capacity for the LWRP is 16.0 mgd. In 2007, the plant treated an average flow of 15 mgd.6

In May 2004 the Sanitation Districts produced the Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant 2020 Plan. The report indicates that the LWRP capacity needs to be expanded to 26.0 mgd to treat the estimated flows of 2020. Expansion of the plant is proposed to occur in two three phases, referred to as Stage V Phase I, Stage V Phase II, and Stage VI Expansions. The Stage V Phase I and Phase II expansions will result in a capacities of 18 and 21 mgd by 2011 and 2014, respectively, summer of 2008. The Stage VI expansion is planned to achieve the 26 mgd capacity needed for the projected flows of 2020 by 2019.4

---

5 County of Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, Correspondence with Ruth I. Frazen, Engineering Technician, Facilities Planning Department, November 15, 2006.
6 County of Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, Correspondence with Ruth I. Frazen, Engineering Technician, Facilities Planning Department, July 26, 2007.
natural gas services, as it would not significantly impact SCG’s system capacity or ability to provide service. Individual development projects would be required to coordinate with SCG to obtain underground natural gas services for proposed construction within the project area. Project applicants would be responsible for the costs associated with any new facilities and/or relocation of existing facilities to accommodate the proposed project. The proposed project’s natural gas distribution plans would be submitted to and approved by the SCG and all gas facilities would be constructed in accordance with SGC and City design standards. Thus, impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

**SOLID WASTE**

- Development associated with buildout of the proposed project would generate solid waste that would incrementally decrease the capacity and lifespan of landfills.

Solid waste generated by uses within the DLSP area would be hauled and delivered to the Lancaster Landfill. Implementation of the DLSP would increase the amount of solid waste being delivered to Lancaster Landfill. However, Lancaster Landfill does have available capacity and resources necessary to accommodate the proposed project. The tonnage increase Waste Management is pursuing (1,700 tons per day to 3,000 tons per day) would accommodate the DLSP. With the DLSP, the Lancaster Landfill would be open and operating and serving the existing and future community until the year 2025 with the tonnage increase. Solid waste pickup would be available for the proposed project although trash trucks may need to be rerouted to accommodate the proposed project. Mitigation measures are recommended to lessen the incremental growth of solid waste by implementing recycling programs for site-specific developments.

**CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

- Development associated with the proposed project and other related cumulative projects would not result in cumulatively considerable public services and utilities impacts.

In relation to past, present, and reasonable foreseeable future development, the proposed project would cumulatively contribute to an increased demand for fire, police, schools, water, sewer, solid waste, and energy utilities. Additional related projects would add to the cumulative demand for such services through the introduction of new residents, tenants, and users of the proposed facilities. However, this growth has been considered for in long-term plans. The proposed project is located in an area that is served by all utilities (i.e., water, sewer, and energy utilities) and other public services (i.e., police, fire, schools, and solid waste). Existing facilities can be readily extended into the area to serve the proposed development. No additional governmental services or activities would be cumulatively impacted by the proposed project. Since the respective providers of such services and facilities have indicated that the proposed project's incremental impacts can be sufficiently mitigated, cumulative impacts on public services and utilities anticipated to result from this development are not considered to be significant.

---

10 Waste Management of Antelope Valley, Phone Conversation with Nicole Stetson, Environmental Protection Specialist, November 2, 2007.
11 Waste Management of Antelope Valley, Phone Conversation with Nicole Stetson, Environmental Protection Specialist, November 2, 2007.
SCHOOLS

PSU-4 Prior to the issuance of building permits, project applicants shall pay all applicable Development Impact Fees to the Lancaster School District and Antelope Valley High School District in place at the time of payment. Proof of fee payment shall be provided to the City of Lancaster.

LIBRARIES

No mitigation measures have been identified.

PARKS AND RECREATION

PSU-6 Prior to issuance of building permits, project applicants shall pay the required Parks Development Fee and Park Acquisition Fee in place at time of payment to the City of Lancaster.

WATER

PSU-7 For each site-specific development, prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicants shall pay all applicable developer fees described in the adopted Rules and Regulations, Part 4, for the Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40, (i.e., groundwater supply fee, groundwater bank, additional wells, additional treatment capacity/facilities, recycled water fee, etc.).

PSU-8 Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall obtain verification from District 40 confirming that adequate water supply and water systems would be available to adequately serve the project in which building permits are being issued.

PSU-9 For each site-specific development, the project applicants shall incorporate water conservation measures into the design of the project. Such methods include using xeriscaping, low water-use turf, or a synthetic grass substitute in landscaped areas to minimize or eliminate the irrigation demand, and install weather-sensitive irrigation timers to ensure all landscaping receives only necessary amount of water.

WASTEWATER (SEWER)

PSU-10 For each site-specific development, prior to the issuance of a Permit to Connect, the Developer shall pay the required connection fees to the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles.

PSU-11 For each site-specific development, prior to issuance of building permits, the Developer shall provide evidence that the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles has sufficient wastewater transmission and treatment plant capacity to accept sewage flows from the buildings for which building permits are being requested.

PSU-12 For each site-specific development, prior to the issuance of building permits, the Developer shall provide engineering studies to the City of Lancaster’s Public Works Department verifying that the sewer system has adequate capacity to serve the
If additional improvements are required, the applicant shall pay the necessary fees required for the sewer system improvements.

**ELECTRICITY**

PSU-13 If, during site-specific development, impacts to SCE facilities or land related rights occur, the impacts to these resources shall be addressed and agreed upon by the City, project applicant and SCE prior to finalizing the development plan and issuance of building permits.

**NATURAL GAS**

No mitigation measures are required.

**SOLID WASTE**

PSU-14 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicants shall develop a Solid Waste Program to encourage recycling. The program shall include provisions to provide bins for recyclable materials (i.e., paper, cardboard, beverage containers, etc.) on site. The project applicants shall be responsible for implementing the program after construction is complete.

PSU-15 The project applicants shall comply with all applicable City, County, and State regulations and procedures for the use, collection, and disposal of solid and hazardous wastes.

**CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

No additional mitigation measures are required.

**5.7.6 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION**

With the exception of water supply and library services, no significant impacts related to public services and utilities have been identified following implementation of the recommended mitigation measures and compliance with the City, State, and Federal regulatory requirements. As noted, the availability of adequate water supply to serve the proposed project at buildout cannot be determined or guaranteed, resulting in a significant and unavoidable project and cumulative impact in regards to water supply. Additionally, implementation of the proposed project would contribute to an existing deficiency to library services, resulting in a significant and unavoidable project and cumulative impact to library services.