


California High-Speed Rail Authority

Palmdale to Burbank *Project Section*

Draft Environmental Impact Report/
Environmental Impact Statement

Appendix 2.0-H Regional and
Local Policy Consistency Analysis

August 2022



The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being or have been carried out by the State of California pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated July 23, 2019, and executed by the Federal Railroad Administration and the State of California.

This page intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 2.0-H: Regional and Local Policy Consistency Analysis

This appendix contains detailed tables in support of the plan consistency analyses described in Chapter 3, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures. Table 2.0-H-1 evaluates consistency of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section Build Alternatives with applicable local and regional plans. Policies and plans for all resource topics discussed in Chapter 3, with the exception of Section 3.4 Noise and Vibration, as well as Chapter 5, Environmental Justice are discussed, below. Noise and vibration effects are subject to FRA and FTA guidance and therefore, the Authority is not required to adhere to regional and local plans and policies. As such, this appendix does not contain a consistency analysis for regional and local policies pertaining to noise and vibration. More information on consistency with regional and local noise and vibration plans and policies can be found in Section 3.4, Noise and Vibration.

Table 2.0-H-1 Regional and Local Policy Consistency Analysis

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Section 3.2 Transportation	
City of Palmdale General Plan (City of Palmdale 1993)	
Policy C2.2.4: Encourages development of regional rail transit serving the Palmdale area.	Consistent. The project includes HSR and associated multimodal linkages. The Palmdale Station would be a multimodal hub that would promote other types of public transit in addition to HSR. Therefore, the Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Palmdale Transit Village Specific Plan (City of Palmdale 2007)	
Palmdale Transit Village Specific Plan, TOD Development Standards, 3.4.1, Purpose and Intent: The Palmdale Transit Specific Plan is a mixed-use transit-oriented developed plan for the area near the Palmdale Transportation Center, which is adjacent to downtown Palmdale. The specific plan encourages a transit-supportive environment configured in a compact pattern and a complementary mix of land use all within comfortable walking and bicycling distance from the Transportation Center.	Consistent. The project proposes an HSR system that would create opportunities to promote multimodal connectivity.
City of Burbank 2035 General Plan (City of Burbank 2013)	
Policy 2.3: Prioritize investments in transportation projects and programs that support viable alternatives to automobile use.	Consistent. The HSR station in Burbank would function as multimodal transportation hub and would be designed as pedestrian friendly environments that encourage first/last mile connectivity. Therefore, these areas would help achieve adopted goals related to transit-oriented development.
Policy 4.8: Promote multimodal transit centers and stops to encourage seamless connections between local and regional transit systems, pedestrian and bicycle networks, and commercial and employment centers	Consistent. The project proposes an HSR system that would improve mobility, accessibility, create multimodal opportunities for Burbank with the implementation of the Burbank Airport Station.
City of Burbank Bicycle Master Plan	
Policy 2: Provide bicycle-friendly connections to transit centers, major employment centers, retail districts, and residential areas to make the overall road network more hospitable to bicycle travel.	Consistent. The project proposes an HSR system that would create opportunities for multimodal connectivity for the city of Burbank.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Section 3.3 Air Quality and Global Climate Change	
Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCAG 2020)	
California High Speed Rail System	Consistent. The California HSR will be electrified and will therefore produce no emissions along its operating corridors. Furthermore, the Authority has committed to using 100% renewable energy to power its trains. Because of the expected reduction in air and automobile travel, the Authority estimates its service will save 2.0 million to 3.2 million barrels of oil annually, beginning in 2030.
Reduce per capita GHG emissions in the SCAG region by 8% by 2020—compared with 2005 levels—and by 13% by 2035.	Consistent. Statewide and regional GHG emissions associated with on-road vehicles and aircrafts would be reduced because travelers would use HSR (identified as a goal in the plan) rather than driving or flying. Therefore, the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would be consistent with this goal.
City of Burbank 2035 General Plan (City of Burbank 2013)	
Policy 1.5 Require projects that generate potentially significant levels of air pollutants, such as landfill operations or large construction projects, to incorporate best available air quality and greenhouse gas mitigation in project design.	Consistent. Programmatic impact avoidance and minimization features (IAMFs) were incorporated into the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section to prevent or reduce construction-period emissions associated with equipment and trucks. These IAMFs set stringent exhaust emissions requirements for on-road and off-road construction equipment. See Section 3.3.4.
Policy 1.6 Require measures to control air pollutant emissions at construction sites and during soil-disturbing or dust generating activities (i.e., tilling, landscaping) for projects requiring such activities.	Consistent. The contractor would prepare a fugitive dust control plan for each distinct construction segment. This plan would include measures such as covering all vehicle loads transported on public roads, watering exposed surfaces and unpaved roads three times daily, and suspending dust-generating activities when average wind speed exceeds 25 mph (AQ-IAMF#1).
Policy 3.2 Establish a goal and strategies to reduce communitywide greenhouse gas emissions by at least 30% from current levels by 2035.	Consistent. Operation of the Build Alternatives would help the State reach the goal established in SB 32 (reduce GHG emissions to a level that is 40% below 1990 conditions). The temporary GHG emissions increase during construction would be offset in a year or more during HSR Phase 1 operations (see Impact AQ#10). The estimated annual reductions generated by the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would represent 0.6% to 0.9% of the statewide GHG reductions needed to achieve the SB 32 goal (see Impact AQ#11).
Policy 3.4 Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from new development by promoting water conservation and recycling; promoting development that is compact, mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly, and transit-oriented; promoting energy-efficient building design and site planning; and improving the jobs/housing ratio.	Consistent. The new Burbank Airport Station would be a multimodal transportation hub and would be designed to be pedestrian-friendly. As a transportation center, the station would also provide an opportunity for Burbank to work toward its TOD goals.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Policy 3.8 Transition all economic sectors, new development, and existing infrastructure and development to low- or zero-carbon energy sources. Encourage implementation and provide incentives for low- or zero-carbon energy sources.</p>	<p>Consistent. Under the 2013 Policy Directive POLI-PLAN-03, the Authority has adopted a goal to purchase 100% of the HSR system's power from renewable energy sources (Authority 2016).</p>
<p>Climate Action Plan (City of Lancaster 2019)</p>	
<p>Reduce GHG emissions from 777,350 MTCO_{2e} in 2015 to 300,980 MTCO_{2e} in 2040.</p>	<p>Consistent. Operation of the Build Alternatives would help the State reach the goal established in SB 32 (reduce GHG emissions to a level that is 40% below 1990 conditions). The temporary GHG emissions increase during construction would be offset in a year or more during HSR Phase 1 operations (see Impact AQ#10). The estimated annual reductions generated by the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would represent 0.6% to 0.9% of the statewide GHG reductions needed to achieve the SB 32 goal (see Impact AQ#11).</p>
<p>City of Palmdale General Plan (City of Palmdale 1993)</p>	
<p>Reduce emissions to 1990 levels by 2035.</p>	<p>Consistent. Operation of the Build Alternatives would help the State reach the goal established in SB 32 (reduce GHG emissions to a level that is 40% below 1990 conditions). The temporary GHG emissions increase during construction would be offset in a year or more during HSR Phase 1 operations (see Impact AQ#10). The estimated annual reductions generated by the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would represent 0.6% to 0.9% of the statewide GHG reductions needed to achieve the SB 32 goal (see Impact AQ#11).</p>
<p>GOAL C2: Reduce the number of trips and vehicle miles traveled by individuals within the Planning Area, to meet regional transportation and air quality goals.</p>	<p>Consistent. Statewide and regional criteria pollutant emissions associated with on-road vehicles would be reduced because travelers would use HSR rather than drive, thereby reducing regional VMT (see Impact AQ#1).</p>
<p>Policy ER5.1: Minimize local air pollution caused by vehicles.</p>	<p>Consistent. Statewide and regional criteria pollutant emissions associated with on-road vehicles would be reduced because travelers would use HSR rather than flying or driving.</p>
<p>Policy ER5.3.3: Reduce ROG and particulate emissions from building materials and construction methods, by promoting the use of nonsolvent-based, high-solid, or water-based coatings, and requiring compliance with all pertinent AVAQMD rules. (General Plan Amendment 04-01, adopted by City Council April 14, 2004).</p>	<p>Consistent. Programmatic IAMFs were incorporated into the design to ensure that the contractor would use low-VOC paint and super-compliant or clean air paint that has a lower VOC content than required by SCAQMD Rule 1113 and AVAQMD Rule 1113 (AQ-IAMF#2)</p>
<p>City of Palmdale Energy Action Plan (City of Palmdale 2011)</p>	
<p>Goal 4: Reduce transportation emissions through alternative vehicles, trip reduction and consolidation, and efficient flow.</p>	<p>Consistent. Statewide and regional criteria pollutant emissions associated with on-road vehicles would be reduced because travelers would use HSR rather than flying or driving.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 (Los Angeles County 2015)	
Policy AQ 1.2: Encourage the use of low or no VOC emitting materials.	Consistent. Programmatic IAMFs were incorporated into the design to ensure that the contractor would use low-VOC paint and super-compliant or clean air paint that has a lower VOC content than required by SCAQMD Rule 1113 and AVAQMD Rule 1113 (AQ-IAMF#2).
Policy AQ 2.4: Coordinate with different agencies to minimize fugitive dust from different sources, activities, and uses.	Consistent. The contractor would prepare a fugitive dust control plan for each distinct construction segment. This plan would include measures such as covering all vehicle loads transported on public roads, watering exposed surfaces and unpaved roads three times daily, and suspending dust-generating activities when average wind speed exceeds 25 mph (AQ-IAMF#1).
Sustainability City Plan (City of Los Angeles 2015)	
By 2025, the City aims to have zero days when air pollution reaches unhealthy levels.	Partially Consistent for all six Build Alternatives. Statewide and regional criteria pollutant emissions associated with on-road vehicles would be reduced because travelers would use HSR rather than flying or driving. However, temporary increases in emissions related to the construction of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section may contribute toward exceedances in local pollutant thresholds (see Impact AQ#7 and AQ#8).
Green LA: An Action Plan to Lead the Nation in Fighting Global Warming (City of Los Angeles 2007)	
Reduce the city's GHG emissions to 35% below 1990 levels by 2030.	Consistent. Operation of the Build Alternatives would help the State reach the goal established in SB 32 (reduce GHG emissions to a level that is 40% below 1990 conditions). The temporary GHG emissions increase during construction would be offset in a year or more during HSR Phase 1 operations (see Impact AQ#10). The estimated annual reductions generated by the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would represent 0.6% to 0.9% of the statewide GHG reductions needed to achieve the SB 32 goal (see Impact AQ#11).
Section 3.5 Electromagnetic Interference and Electromagnetic Fields	
City of Burbank Municipal Code (2019)	
Ordinance 10-1-1703: Devices which radiate radio-frequency energy shall be so operated as not to cause interference with any activity carried on beyond the boundary line of the property upon which the device is located. Radio-frequency energy is electromagnetic energy at any frequency in the radio spectrum between ten (10) kilocycles and three (3) million megacycles.	Consistent. The City of Burbank's Ordinance 10-1-1703 limits EMI between 10 kHz and 3,000 GHz so as to not interfere with other electrical devices located on adjacent properties. Federal and State laws and regulations apply to a wider frequency range and provide more stringent regulations than the City of Burbank ordinance. The Build Alternative's compliance with federal and State laws and regulations would result in consistency with the City of Burbank ordinance.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
City of Palmdale General Plan (1993)	
Policy S.2.6.1: If, in the future, conclusive evidence links electromagnetic fields (EMF) associated with electrical distribution lines, electrical distribution stations, or transformers with deleterious health effects, develop standards for construction, building setbacks, and/or land use restrictions for those areas impacted by hazardous EMF fields.	Consistent. The City of Palmdale policy cited does not set specific limits or standards regarding EMF exposure, but simply reserves the right to develop standards or impose restrictions in the future if evidence warrants. As this is a policy about developing a policy, there is no actionable regulatory requirement that can be evaluated for consistency with the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section.
Section 3.6 Public Utilities and Energy	
City of Palmdale General Plan (1993)	
Policy PS 1.1.1: Ensure that all new development in Palmdale provides for the infrastructure and public services needed to support it.	Consistent. All six Build Alternatives would not preclude the adequate provision of available public services or facilities to development in Palmdale because, with the implementation of PUE-MM#1 and PUE-MM#2, the Authority would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the proposed project.
Policy PS 1.1.2: Require all new development, including major modifications to existing development, to construct or provide a fair share contribution towards construction of required off-site improvements needed to support the project.	Consistent. The Authority would ensure that development of the six Build Alternatives and Palmdale Station in the City of Palmdale contributes its fair share contribution toward construction of required off-site improvements needed to support the project (PUE-MM#1 and PUE-MM#2).
Policy PS 1.1.3: Require that on- and off-site improvements are constructed prior to occupancy of a new development project, or phase thereof, unless otherwise approved by the City.	Consistent. The Authority would ensure that all basic infrastructure needs are constructed or relocated prior to, or concurrent with, development of the six Build Alternatives (PUE-IAMF#2).
Policy PS 1.1.5: When new development is proposed in vacant, rural areas which have not yet been master-planned for provision of infrastructure, require that development proponents provide for or contribute a fair share towards development of regional master facility plans for roads, sewer, water, drainage, schools, libraries, parks, fire and other community facilities, prior to granting conditional approval of development applications.	Consistent. The Authority would contribute its fair share toward infrastructure development planning in vacant or rural areas in Palmdale (PUE-MM#1 and PUE-MM#2).
Policy PS 1.2.1: Require that provision of streets, sewer, water, drainage and other needed infrastructure be coordinated in a logical manner between adjacent developments, so as to reduce cost of design, construction and maintenance.	Consistent. The Authority would coordinate relocation or improvement of drainage or sewer facilities in a logical manner to reduce costs where possible (PUE-IAMF#2).

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Policy PS 1.2.2: Require that individual development projects integrate with adjacent development with respect to backbone infrastructure (streets, sewer, water and drainage) If adjacent property is undeveloped, a conceptual plan should be prepared to show that the pending development will allow for future integration and development of adjacent properties in a manner which is reasonable from a design, construction and cost standpoint.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Authority would coordinate infrastructure with adjacent development or anticipated development on adjacent property to allow for the future integration of backbone infrastructure.</p>
<p>Policy PS 1.2.8: Distribute the costs of extending infrastructure equitably among those benefiting from the improvements.</p>	<p>Consistent. The six Build Alternatives would not preclude the adequate provision of available public services or facilities to development in Palmdale because the Authority would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the proposed project (PUE-MM#1 and PUE-MM#2).</p>
<p>Policy PS 1.6.2: Coordinate installation of utility line placement with street construction where possible to minimize cost.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Authority would coordinate the installation of relocated utility lines with any street improvements associated with the six Build Alternatives where feasible (PUE-IAMF#4).</p>
<p>Policy PS 1.6.3: Through the development review process, protect existing utility easements and require dedication of additional easements where needed.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Authority would coordinate with the city during the development review process to protect or provide utility easements as required by the six Build Alternatives.</p>
<p>Policy PS 2.1.1: Require new development to obtain adequate water service to meet the increased service needs generated by that development.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Maintenance Facility would be designed to ensure that adequate water supply systems meeting minimum standards for domestic and emergency supply and quality without detracting from the City of Palmdale to serve residences and businesses in the city. Additionally, the average annual water use for the Palmdale Station would be approximately 75 percent less than the existing land use demand.</p>
<p>Policy PS 2.1.3: Promote water conservation and long-term water management in all phases of development planning and construction, through policies and implementation measures contained in the Environmental Resources Element.</p>	<p>Consistent. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be implemented to propose best management practices to manage water use and prevent runoff pollution during construction (HYD-IAMF#3). The California HSR System would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the 2010 Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code) mandatory and voluntary sections for all planning, procurement, design, construction, operations, and maintenance of facilities. Stormwater would be either managed on-site to supply the facility's internal water demands and landscaping or released for management through acceptable natural time-scale surface flow, groundwater recharge, agricultural use, or adjacent building needs.</p>
<p>Policy PS 2.2.2: Require new development to pay necessary fees for expansion of the sewage disposal system to the appropriate agencies, to handle the increased load which it will generate.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Authority would pay its fair share of necessary fees for expansion of the sewage disposal system to accommodate wastewater treatment demand generated by the six Build Alternatives in the City of Palmdale (PUE-MM#1 and PUE-MM#2).</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Policy PS 3.1.2: Evaluate the impact of all new development and expansion of existing facilities on storm runoff and ensure that the cost of upgrading existing drainage facilities to handle the additional runoff is paid for by the development that generates it.	Consistent. Refer to Impact PUE#9 for a discussion of the Build Alternatives' consistency with evaluating the expansion of stormwater runoff facilities based on those uses that generate the increase in runoff. PUE-MM#2 would be implemented to ensure wastewater infrastructure needs and fair share impact fees for improvements to relevant systems.
Policy PS 3.1.5: Require and provide for on-going maintenance of drainage and detention facilities, to ensure their continued effectiveness in controlling runoff.	Consistent. Refer to Impact PUE#9 for a discussion of the Build Alternatives' consistency with evaluating the expansion of stormwater runoff and wastewater facilities based on those uses that generate the increase in runoff. PUE-MM#2 would be implemented to ensure wastewater infrastructure needs and fair share impact fees for improvements to relevant systems. HYD-IAMF#3 would be implemented to require a SWPPP that would propose best management practices to manage water use and prevent runoff pollution during construction.
Policy PS 3.2.1: Where feasible, plan for detention or retention facilities in areas where groundwater recharge can be accomplished.	Consistent. HYD-IAMF#3 would be implemented to require a SWPPP that would propose best management practices to manage water use and prevent runoff pollution during construction, including detention where required.
Objective PS 6.1: Implement the City's adopted Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP) (adopted on November 14, 1991, by Resolution 91-236).	Consistent. During operation, the California HSR System would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of the infrastructure. Operation of the Palmdale Station would result in the generation of municipal solid waste. Through compliance with AB 939, waste generated by the operation of the Palmdale Station is not anticipated to be substantial. As discussed in Impact PUE#10, the California HSR System would be required to comply with the CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated. Through these waste management requirements, the Build Alternatives would reduce waste generation during construction and operation in compliance with the SWMP.
Policy PS 6.1.1: Review proposed development with respect to the SWMP to ensure consistency.	Consistent. The Authority would ensure that all development associated with the six Build Alternatives is consistent with the SWMP.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Policy PS 6.1.3: Continue to implement the City's adopted waste reduction and recycling programs in compliance with the SWMP.	Consistent. During operation, the California HSR System would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of the infrastructure. Operation of the Palmdale Station would result in the generation of municipal solid waste. Through compliance with AB 939, waste generated by the operation of the Palmdale Station is not anticipated to be substantial. As discussed in Impact PUE#10, the California HSR System would be required to comply with the CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated. Through these waste management requirements, the Build Alternatives would reduce waste generation during construction and operation in compliance with the SWMP.
Policy PS 8.2.1: Incorporate applicable Federal Communications Commission standards into the review and approval process for communication facilities.	Consistent. The Authority would follow all Federal Communications Commission standards when either protecting in place or relocating communication facilities.
Policy PS 8.2.2: Ensure that the location, design, and construction of communication facilities provide an acceptable level of safety to the public.	Consistent. The Authority would ensure that the location, design, and construction of communication facilities provide an acceptable level of safety to the public if communication facilities must be relocated as a result of the six Build Alternatives.
City of Palmdale Energy Action Plan (2011)	
Goal 1: Reduce energy demand through energy conservation and efficiency.	Consistent. The project design incorporates elements that minimize electricity consumption (e.g., regenerative braking and energy-saving equipment and facilities). All California HSR System facilities, including the Maintenance Facility and Palmdale Station, would comply with Title 24 to achieve California energy efficiency standards. To the extent feasible, renewable energy would power the California HSR System. Overall, the Build Alternatives project would reduce energy demand through energy conservation and efficiency (Impact PUE#11).
Goal 6: Reduce Waste	Consistent. During operation, the California HSR System would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of infrastructure. Operation of the Palmdale Station would result in the generation of municipal solid waste. Solid waste generated by operation of the Palmdale Station is not anticipated to be substantial. As discussed in Impact PUE#5, the HSR project would be required to comply with the CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated. The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Action 1.3.1: Implement the minimum Title 24 standards for energy efficiency.	<p>Consistent. The project design incorporates elements that minimize electricity consumption (e.g., regenerative braking and energy-saving equipment and facilities). All California HSR System facilities, including the Maintenance Facility and Palmdale Station, would comply with Title 24 to achieve California energy efficiency standards. To the extent feasible, renewable energy would power the California HSR System. Overall, the Build Alternatives project would reduce energy demand through energy conservation and efficiency (Impact PUE#11).</p>
Action 1.3.2: Encourage new construction, remodels over 50%, and tenant improvements to exceed Title 24 energy use requirements by 15%.	<p>Consistent. The project design incorporates elements that minimize electricity consumption (e.g., regenerative braking and energy-saving equipment and facilities). All California HSR System facilities, including the Maintenance Facility and Palmdale Station, would be required to meet or exceed Title 24 to achieve California energy efficiency standards. To the extent feasible, renewable energy would power the California HSR System. Overall, the Build Alternatives project would reduce energy demand through energy conservation and efficiency (Impact PUE#11).</p>
Measure 2.3: Reduce Water Use 20%. Facilitate a 20% reduction in water use by 2020 to exceed the 20X2020 initiative.	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections for all planning, procurement, design, construction, operations, and maintenance of facilities. PUE-MM#1 would require the Authority to utilize non-potable water for construction and during operations where feasible. Stormwater would be either managed on-site to supply the facility's internal water demands and landscaping, or released for management through acceptable natural time-scale surface flow, groundwater recharge, agricultural use, or adjacent building needs. Therefore, the Build Alternatives would not interfere with the city's goal to facilitate a 20% reduction in water use by 2020.</p>
Measure 2.3.1: Continue to implement the City's Water Conservation Ordinance.	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections for all planning, procurement, design, construction, operations, and maintenance of facilities. PUE-MM#1 would require the Authority to utilize non-potable water for construction and during operations where feasible. Stormwater would be either managed on-site to supply the facility's internal water demands and landscaping, or released for management through acceptable natural time-scale surface flow, groundwater recharge, agricultural use, or adjacent building needs. Therefore, the Build Alternatives would not interfere with the city's Water Conservation Ordinance.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Measure 6.2: Solid Waste Diversion. Achieve an 80% diversion of landfilled waste by 2020.	Consistent. During operation, the California HSR System would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of infrastructure. Operation of the Palmdale Station would result in the generation of municipal solid waste. Solid waste generated by operation of the Palmdale Station is not anticipated to be substantial. As discussed below in Impact PUE#5, the HSR project would be required to comply with the CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated. The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills.
Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 (2015)	
Goal PS/F 1: A coordinated, reliable, and equitable network of public facilities that preserves resources, ensures public health and safety, and keeps pace with planned development.	Consistent. The Authority would either protect in place or relocate public facilities affected by the construction of the Build Alternatives in a way that preserves resources, ensures public health and safety, and keeps pace with planned development.
Policy PS/F 1.2: Ensure that adequate services and facilities are provided in conjunction with development through phasing or other mechanisms.	Consistent. The Authority would coordinate with local utility providers during construction and operation of the Build Alternatives to ensure that adequate services and facilities are maintained. Examples of coordination activities include issuance of underground service alerts and public notices advertising anticipated disruption in utility services during construction of the Build Alternatives (PUE-IAMF#3).
Policy PS/F 1.3: Ensure coordinated service provision through collaboration between County departments and service providers.	Consistent. The Authority would coordinate with local utility providers during construction and operation of the Build Alternatives to ensure that adequate services and facilities are maintained. Examples of coordination activities include issuance of underground service alerts and public notices advertising anticipated disruption in utility services during construction of the Build Alternatives (PUE-IAMF#3).
Policy PS/F 2.1: Support water conservation measures.	Consistent. During construction and operation, the California HSR System would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections.
Goal PS/F 4: Reliable sewer and urban runoff conveyance treatment systems.	Consistent. Refer to Impact PUE#9 for a discussion of the Build Alternatives' consistency with evaluating the expansion of wastewater runoff facilities based on those uses that generate the increase in runoff. PUE-MM#2 would be implemented to ensure wastewater infrastructure needs and fair share impact fees for improvements to relevant systems.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Goal PS/F 5: Adequate disposal capacity and minimal waste and pollution.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Authority would comply with the adopted county solid waste management plan. During operation, the Build Alternatives would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of infrastructure. As discussed in Impact PUE#10, the HSR project would be required to comply with the CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated. The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills. Furthermore, adequate landfill disposal capacity exists for accommodation of wastes generated by the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section in Los Angeles County.</p>
<p>Policy PS/F 5.1: Maintain an efficient, safe and responsive waste management system that reduces waste while protecting the health and safety of the public.</p>	<p>Consistent. During operation, the HSR project would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of infrastructure. As discussed in Impact PUE#10, the HSR project would be required to comply with the CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated. The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills. Therefore, the HSR project would not interfere with the maintenance of an efficient, safe, and responsive waste management system.</p>
<p>Policy PS/F 5.5: Reduce the County's waste stream by minimizing waste generation and enhancing diversion.</p>	<p>Consistent. During operation, the HSR project would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of infrastructure. As discussed in Impact PUE#10, the HSR project would be required to comply with the CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated. The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills. Therefore, the HSR project would not interfere with the maintenance of an efficient, safe, and responsive waste management system.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Policy PS/F 5.7: Encourage the recycling of construction and demolition debris generated by public and private projects.	Consistent. The Authority would comply with the adopted county solid waste management plan. During operation, the HSR project would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of infrastructure. As discussed in Impact PUE#10, the HSR project would be required to comply with the CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated. The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills. Therefore, the HSR project would not interfere with the maintenance of an efficient, safe, and responsive waste management system.
Policy PS/F 5.9: Encourage the availability of trash and recyclables containers in new developments, public streets, and large venues.	Consistent. During construction, the Authority would ensure the availability of trash and recyclable containers for appropriate disposal of construction and demolition waste. During operation, there are no facilities that are anticipated to generate waste within unincorporated Los Angeles County. Therefore, the availability of trash and recyclable containers would not be necessary.
Goal PS/F 6: A County with adequate public utilities.	Consistent. The California HSR System would not preclude the adequate provision of available public services or facilities to development in Los Angeles County because the Authority would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the proposed project (PUE-MM#1 and PUE-MM#2).
Policy PS/F 6.1: Ensure efficient and cost-effective utilities that serve existing and future needs.	Consistent. The California HSR System would not preclude the adequate provision of available public services or facilities to development in Los Angeles County because the Authority would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the proposed project (PUE-MM#1 and PUE-MM#2).
Policy PS/F 6.4: Protect and enhance utility facilities to maintain the safety, reliability, integrity and security of utility services.	Consistent. The Authority would ensure that all communication service providers' facilities are either protected in place or relocated if they would be in conflict with any of the Build Alternative improvements. If facilities must be relocated, the Authority would ensure that relocation of the utilities would not result in adverse impacts to the safety, reliability, integrity, or security of utility services.
Policy PS/F 6.6: Encourage the construction of utilities underground, where feasible.	Consistent. The Authority would relocate utilities in unincorporated Los Angeles County underground where feasible.
Policy PS/F 6.7: Discourage aboveground electrical distribution and transmission lines in hazard areas.	Consistent. The Authority would not relocate aboveground utilities in unincorporated Los Angeles County in hazard areas.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
City of Los Angeles General Plan (2001)	
<p>Goal 9C: Adequate water supply, storage facilities, and delivery system to serve the needs of existing and future residents and businesses.</p>	<p>Consistent. Because there are no facilities proposed within the city of Los Angeles, the construction and operation of the Burbank Airport station would not result in a significant increase in water use within this service area.</p>
<p>Goal 9G: An environmentally sound solid waste management system that protects public health, safety, and natural resources and minimizes adverse environmental impacts.</p>	<p>Consistent. During operation, the California HSR System would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of the infrastructure. Discussed in Impact PUE#10, the California HSR System would be required to comply with the CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated.</p>
<p>Objective 9.6: Pursue effective and efficient approaches to reducing stormwater runoff and protecting water quality.</p>	<p>Consistent. A SWPPP would be implemented to propose best management practices to manage water use and prevent runoff pollution during construction and operation.</p>
<p>Objective 9.10: Ensure that water supply, storage, and delivery systems are adequate to support planned development.</p>	<p>Partially Inconsistent. The California HSR System would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the 2010 Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code) mandatory and voluntary sections for all planning, procurement, design, construction, operations, and maintenance of facilities. However, construction and operation of the Burbank Airport station would result in a significant increase in water use, potentially beyond the projected capacity of the service area. PUE-MM#1 would require the Authority to pay water agencies its fair share of fees and use non-potable water where possible during construction and operation.</p>
<p>Policy 9.1.3: Monitor wastewater effluent discharged into the Los Angeles River, Santa Monica Bay, and San Pedro Harbor to ensure compliance with water quality requirements.</p>	<p>Consistent. A SWPPP would be implemented to propose best management practices to manage water use and prevent runoff pollution during construction and would ensure compliance with City of Los Angeles water quality requirements (HYD-IAMF#3).</p>
<p>Policy 9.2.2: Maintain wastewater treatment capacity commensurate with population and industrial needs.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Authority would pay its fair share of necessary fees for expansion of the sewage disposal system, is necessary, to accommodate wastewater treatment demand generated by the six Build Alternatives.</p>
<p>Policy 9.9.1: Pursue all economically efficient water conservation measures at the local and statewide level.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the 2010 Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code) mandatory and voluntary sections for all planning, procurement, design, construction, operations, and maintenance of facilities. Stormwater would be either managed on-site to supply the facility's internal water demands and landscaping or released for management through acceptable natural time-scale surface flow, groundwater recharge, agricultural use, or adjacent building needs.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Policy 9.9.3: Protect existing water supplies from contamination, and clean up groundwater supplies so those resources can be more fully utilized.	Consistent. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be implemented to propose best management practices to manage water use and prevent runoff pollution during construction and operation (HYD-IAMF#3). This includes detention facilities where required.
Policy 9.9.7: Incorporate water conservation practices in the design of new projects so as not to impede the City's ability to supply water to its other users or overdraft its groundwater basins.	Partially Inconsistent. The California HSR System would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the 2010 Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code) mandatory and voluntary sections for all planning, procurement, design, construction, operations, and maintenance of facilities. However, construction and operation of the Burbank Airport station would result in a significant increase in water use, potentially beyond the projected capacity of the service area. PUE-MM#1 would require the Authority to pay water agencies its fair share of fees and use non-potable water where possible during construction and operation.
Policy 9.29.3: Promote conservation and energy efficiency to the maximum extent that is cost effective and practical, including potential retrofitting when considering significant expansion of existing structures.	Consistent. The project design incorporates elements that minimize electricity consumption (e.g., regenerative braking and energy-saving equipment and facilities). All California HSR System facilities would comply with Title 24 to achieve California energy efficiency standards. To the extent feasible, renewable energy would power the California HSR System. Overall, the Build Alternatives project would reduce energy demand through energy conservation and efficiency (Impact PUE#11).
City of Santa Clarita General Plan (2011)	
Objective CO 1.3: Conserve and make more efficient use of non-renewable resource systems, such as fossil fuels, minerals, and materials.	Consistent. The project design incorporates elements that minimize electricity consumption (e.g., regenerative braking and energy-saving equipment and facilities). All California HSR System facilities would comply with Title 24 to achieve California energy efficiency standards. To the extent feasible, renewable energy would power the California HSR System. Overall, the Build Alternatives project would reduce energy demand through energy conservation and efficiency (Impact PUE#11).
Policy CO 1.3.1: Explore, evaluate, and implement methods to shift from using non-renewable resources to use of renewable resources in all aspects of land use planning and development.	Consistent. The project design incorporates elements that minimize electricity consumption (e.g., regenerative braking and energy-saving equipment and facilities). To the extent feasible, renewable energy would power the California HSR System.
Policy CO 1.3.2: Promote reducing, reusing, and recycling in all Land Use designations and cycles of development.	Consistent. As discussed in Impact PUE#5, the HSR project would be required to comply with the CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated. The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills.
Burbank 2035 General Plan (2013)	

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Policy 2.6: Design new buildings to minimize the consumption of energy, water, and other natural resources.	Consistent. The California HSR System would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the 2010 Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code) mandatory and voluntary sections for all facilities, including the Burbank Airport Station. PUE-MM#1 would require the Authority to use non-potable water where possible during construction and operation to reduce water consumption to the extent possible.
Policy 4.12: Underground utilities for new development projects and projects within designated undergrounding districts.	Consistent. The Authority would relocate utilities in the city of Burbank underground where feasible.
Policy 9.1: Meet the goal of a 20% reduction in municipal water use by 2020	Inconsistent. The construction and operation of the Burbank Airport station would result in a significant increase in water use, potentially beyond the projected capacity of the service area. PUE-MM#1 would require the Authority to pay water agencies its fair share of fees and use non-potable water where possible during construction and operation.
Policy 10.1: Incorporate energy conservation strategies in City projects.	Consistent. The project design incorporates elements that minimize electricity consumption (e.g., regenerative braking and energy-saving equipment and facilities). The Burbank Airport Station would comply with Title 24 to achieve California energy efficiency standards. To the extent feasible, renewable energy would power the California HSR System. Overall, the Build Alternatives project would reduce energy demand through energy conservation and efficiency (Impact PUE#11).
Policy 10.2: Promote energy-efficient design features to reduce fuel consumption for heating and cooling.	Consistent. The project design incorporates elements that minimize electricity consumption (e.g., regenerative braking and energy-saving equipment and facilities). The Burbank Airport Station would comply with Title 24 to achieve California energy efficiency standards. To the extent feasible, renewable energy would power the California HSR System. Overall, the Build Alternatives project would reduce energy demand through energy conservation and efficiency (Impact PUE#11).
Policy 10.5: Promote technologies that reduce use of non-renewable energy resources.	Consistent. The project design incorporates elements that minimize electricity consumption (e.g., regenerative braking and energy-saving equipment and facilities). To the extent feasible, renewable energy would power the California HSR System.
City of Burbank Sustainability Action Plan (2008)	
Action 1.1: Renewable Energy Policy – Continue to implement measures supporting the City’s goals of achieving 33 percent renewable energy by 2020.	Consistent. The project design incorporates elements that minimize electricity consumption (e.g., regenerative braking and energy-saving equipment and facilities). To the extent feasible, renewable energy would power the California HSR System.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Action 1.2: Acquire Additional Renewable Energy – Carryout plans to add the energy equivalent of 25 MW of geothermal and 55 MW of solar.	Consistent. The Authority has designated staff working to collaborate with utilities and renewable energy developers (who may construct facilities that contribute wind, solar, or other renewable sources to the power grid).
Action 2.3. Green Building Energy Efficiency – Develop a “green practices” ordinance for all applicable projects to achieve ten percent energy efficiency over baseline – Title 24 requirements.	Consistent. The project design incorporates elements that minimize electricity consumption (e.g., regenerative braking and energy-saving equipment and facilities). The Burbank Airport Station would comply with Title 24 to achieve California energy efficiency standards.
Action 4.3. Construction & Demolition Wastes – Implement the now mandatory Construction and Demolition (C&D) ordinance that requires 50 percent recycling of construction materials. Review and increase the minimum recycling rate periodically as C&D processes and markets improve. Assist contractors and buildings in locating C&D materials recovery facilities (MRF’s), materials exchange opportunities, and other reuse and recycling sources.	Consistent. As discussed in Impact PUE#5, the HSR project would be required to comply with the CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated. The Authority’s 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills.
Action 19.5. Recycled Water – Continue instituting Burbank’s Recycled Water Master Plan. Clarify customer requirements for the use of recycled water landscaping purposes.	Consistent. PUE-MM#1 would require the Authority to use non-potable water where possible during construction and operation to reduce water consumption to the extent possible.
Action 21.1. Water Conserving Fixtures – Continue to offer rebates that encourage the use of waterless urinals, high efficiency toilets, and other water conserving fixtures to decrease the volume of wastewater for treatment.	Consistent. PUE-MM#2 would require the Authority to prepare a wastewater analysis that identifies wastewater infrastructure needs for the operation of the Burbank Airport Station. The Authority would coordinate for the construction of adequate wastewater infrastructure and pay fair share impact fees for improvements to the relevant sewer systems if needed.
Section 3.7 Biological and Aquatic Resources	
Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 (2015)	
Conservation and Natural Resources Element, Policy 3.11: Discourage development in riparian habitats, streambeds, wetlands, and other native woodlands in order to maintain and support their preservation in a natural state, unaltered by grading, fill, or diversion activities.	Consistent. All six Build Alternatives would affect riparian habitats, streambeds, wetlands, and other native woodlands; however, the Authority designed these Build Alternatives to minimize direct surface impacts on significant ecological resources, including aquatic resources. Implementation of IAMFs (Section 3.7.4.2) and mitigation measures (Section 3.7.7) would further reduce impacts on riparian habitats, streambeds, wetlands, and other native woodlands by minimizing impacts from grading, fill, or diversion activities and restoring disturbed habitat.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Conservation and Natural Resources Element, Policy 7: The county will protect SEAs and habitat management areas by appropriate measures, including preservation, mitigation, and enhancement.</p>	<p>Consistent. All six Build Alternative alignments would traverse the San Andreas, Santa Clara River, and Tujunga Valley / Hansen Dam SEAs within unincorporated Los Angeles County. However, the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would implement IAMFs and mitigation measures to reduce impacts on biological resources and to preserve and enhance biological resources throughout the region.</p>
<p>Conservation and Open Space Element, Policies 12 and 13: The county will protect watersheds, streams, and riparian vegetation to minimize water pollution, soil erosion, and sedimentation; to maintain natural habitats; and to aid in groundwater recharge.</p>	<p>Consistent. All six Build Alternatives would affect watersheds, streams, and riparian vegetation; however, the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would implement IAMFs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts on watersheds and natural habitats.</p>
<p>Conservation and Open Space Element, Policy 35: The county will support the preservation of heritage trees and encourage tree planting programs to enhance the beauty of the urban landscape.</p>	<p>Consistent. Where the construction of the six Build Alternatives would affect trees within Los Angeles County, BIO-MM#35 would compensate for impacts on protected trees through replacement.</p>
<p>Land Use Element, Policy 20: The county will establish land use controls that afford effective protection for significant ecological and habitat resources and lands of major scenic value.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Authority designed all six Build Alternatives to avoid direct surface impacts on significant ecological and habitat resources and lands of major scenic value. Implementation of IAMFs and mitigation measures would minimize and avoid impacts.</p>
Los Angeles County Antelope Valley Area Plan 2035 (2015)	
<p>Conservation and Open Space Element (COS), Policy COS 4.4: Require new development in SEAs to consider the following in design of the project, to the greatest extent feasible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Preservation of biologically valuable habitats, species, wildlife corridors and linkages; ▪ Protection of sensitive resources on the site within open space; ▪ Protection of water resources from hydromodification in order to maintain the ecological function of riparian habitats; ▪ Placement of development in the least biologically sensitive areas on the site, prioritizing the preservation or avoidance of the most sensitive biological resources onsite; ▪ Design of required open spaces to retain contiguous undisturbed open space that preserves the most sensitive biological resources onsite and / or serves to maintain connectivity; ▪ Maintenance of watershed connectivity by capturing, treating, retaining and / or infiltrating stormwater flows on site; and <p>Consideration of the continuity of onsite open space with adjacent open space in project design.</p>	<p>Consistent. All six Build Alternative alignments would traverse the San Andreas, Santa Clara River, and Tujunga Valley / Hansen Dam SEAs, and would disturb or interfere with biologic resources including wildlife corridors, water resources, and contiguous open spaces. However, implementation of IAMFs and mitigation measures would minimize impacts on SEA resources.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Conservation and Open Space Element (COS), Policy COS 4.9: Ensure waterbodies are well-maintained to protect habitat areas and provide water to local species.	Consistent. All six Build Alternatives would affect waterbodies throughout Los Angeles County; however, the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would implement IAMFs to protect water quality and aquatic habitat.
Conservation and Open Space Element, Policy COS 16.1: Except within Economic Opportunity Areas, require new development to minimize removal of native vegetation. Discourage the clear-scraping of land and ensure that a large percentage of land is left in its natural state.	Inconsistent. Construction of each of the six Build Alternatives would require ground disturbance and native vegetation removal throughout the Build Alternative footprint. However, the Restoration and Revegetation Plan (BIO-MM#6) would require that temporarily disturbed areas be restored to pre-project conditions.
Conservation and Open Space Element, Policy COS 16.2: Maximize the use of native vegetation in landscaped areas, provided that vegetation meets all applicable requirements of the Fire Department and the Department of Public Works.	Consistent. The Restoration and Revegetation Plan (BIO-MM#6) would prioritize native forbs and grasses to maximize the use of native vegetation throughout disturbed areas.
Conservation and Open Space Element, Policy COS 18.1: Encourage government agencies and conservancies to acquire mitigation lands in the following areas and preserve them as permanent open space: Significant Ecological Areas, including Joshua Tree Woodlands, wildlife corridors, and other sensitive habitat areas.	Consistent. Implementation of each of the six Build Alternatives would require compensatory mitigation (BIO-MM#38 through BIO-MM#50). Acquisition of off-site mitigation lands would prioritize those areas that maximize biological resources and would evaluate SEAs for potential compensatory mitigation opportunities.
Conservation and Open Space Element, Policy COS 19.1: When new development is required to preserve open space, require designs with large contiguous open space areas that maximize protection of environmental and scenic resources.	Consistent. Implementation of each of the six Build Alternatives would require compensatory mitigation (BIO-MM#38 through BIO-MM#50). Acquisition of off-site mitigation lands would prioritize large, contiguous areas that maximize the value and viability of protected habitat.
Mobility Element (M), Policy M 7.2: Encourage the creation of wildlife underpasses and overpasses, fencing, signage, and other measures to minimize impacts on wildlife at junctures where transit infrastructure passes through or across sensitive habitats.	Consistent. The <i>Palmdale to Burbank Project Section: Wildlife Corridor Assessment Report</i> (Authority 2019c) describes potential effects of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section on wildlife movement. Results of this study are discussed further in Section 3.7.5.11 and under Impact BIO#13 in Section 3.7.6.3.
Mobility Element (M), Policy M 7.4: Where the creation of new or the retrofit of roadways or other transportation systems is necessary in areas with sensitive habitats, particularly SEAs, use best practice design to encourage species passage and minimize genetic diversity losses.	Consistent. The <i>Palmdale to Burbank Project Section: Wildlife Corridor Assessment Report</i> (Authority 2019c) analysis mentioned above considered SEAs in proximity to the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section. Results of this study are discussed further in Section 3.7.5.11 and under Impact BIO#13 in Section 3.7.6.3.
Los Angeles County Code of Ordinances (2016)	
Section 12.28, Brush and Vegetation, Policy 12.28.030: No person shall remove or destroy, or cause the removal or destruction of natural vegetation (native plants, grasses, shrubs, trees, and roots) on sloping terrain within the unincorporated territory of the County of Los Angeles.	Consistent. Construction of each of the six Build Alternatives would require the removal or destruction of natural vegetation on sloping terrain within the unincorporated territory of Los Angeles County. However, the Restoration and Revegetation Plan (BIO-MM#6) would ensure that temporarily disturbed areas be restored to pre-project conditions.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Section 12.28, Brush and Vegetation, Policy 17.04.340: A person shall not dig, remove, destroy, injure, mutilate, or cut any tree, plant, shrub, grass, fruit, or flower, or any portion thereof, growing in a park. Any removal of wood, turf, grass, soil, rock, sand, or gravel from any park is unlawful.</p>	<p>Consistent. Construction of each of the six Build Alternatives could entail surface disturbance or vegetation removal within the following existing or proposed parks operated by the Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agua Dulce Canyon Parkland (Refined SR14 and SR14A) ▪ Palmdale Hills Trail (Proposed Extension) (E1, E1A, E2, and E2A) ▪ Vasquez Loop Trail (Proposed Extension) (E1, E1A, E2, and E2A) ▪ Littlerock Trail (Proposed Extension) (E1, E1A, E2, and E2A) ▪ Acton Community Trail (Proposed Extension) (E1, E1A, E2, and E2A) <p>Construction activities could disturb vegetation within these County of Los Angeles parks. However, the Restoration and Revegetation Plan (BIO-MM#6) would ensure restoration of temporarily disturbed areas to pre-project conditions.</p>
<p>Section 12.28, Brush and Vegetation, Policy 17.04.470: A person shall not molest, hunt, disturb, injure, shoot at, take, net, poison, wound, harm, kill, or remove from any park or riding and hiking trail any kind of animal.</p>	<p>Consistent. Construction of each of the six Build Alternatives could entail surface disturbance within the following existing or proposed parks operated by the Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agua Dulce Canyon Parkland (Refined SR14 and SR14A) ▪ Palmdale Hills Trail (Proposed Extension) (E1, E1A, E2, and E2A) ▪ Vasquez Loop Trail (Proposed Extension) (E1, E1A, E2, and E2A) ▪ Littlerock Trail (Proposed Extension) (E1, E1A, E2, and E2A) ▪ Acton Community Trail (Proposed Extension) (E1, E1A, E2, and E2A) <p>Construction activities could disturb wildlife within these County of Los Angeles parks. However, the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would implement multiple IAMFs and mitigation measures (defined in Section 3.7.4.2 Section 3.7.6, respectively) to reduce impacts on animals.</p>
<p>Title 22, Planning and Zoning, Chapter 22.176: The Oak Tree Permit preserves and maintains healthy oak trees during the development process.</p>	<p>Consistent. Construction and operation of each of the six Build Alternatives would likely cause direct disturbances to oak trees. However, BIO-MM#35 would compensate for impacts on protected trees and restrict construction disturbance near trees adjacent to the Build Alternative footprint, consistent with the purpose of this policy.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Lancaster General Plan 2030 (2009)	
<p>Plan for the Natural Environment: Biological Resources, Policy 3.4.1: Presents a comprehensive management program designed to preserve and protect important biological resources in the Lancaster sphere of influence. This includes cooperating with federal, state, and local agencies in the development of the West Mojave multi-species conservation plan and the creation or protection of open space lands, watersheds, wildlife habitats, wetlands, and scenic lands. This policy encourages innovative techniques for the preservation of sensitive area and requires a periodic review of the existing zoning ordinances, subdivision regulations, and environmental review.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Authority designed the six Build Alternatives such that they avoid significant wash and open space areas to protect sensitive species. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the Authority has proposed mitigation measures to address impacts on special-status species and ensure their protection.</p>
<p>Plan for the Natural Environment: Biological Resources, Policies 3.4.2 through 3.4.3: Seek to preserve significant wash and open space areas to protect sensitive species that utilize these habitats. As part of the specific environmental review this policy requires the evaluation of natural desert wash habitats which could be impacted by development and determine their potential to support special-status species. Areas considered highly important shall be protected. A buffer around highly important areas shall be undertaken to preserve from intrusion by future surrounding land uses. This policy also will investigate the potential for the purchase of adjacent land as areas for mitigation for development.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Authority designed the six Build Alternatives such that they avoid significant wash and open space areas to protect sensitive species. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the Authority has proposed mitigation measures to address impacts on special-status species and ensure their protection, as discussed in Section 3.7.7, Mitigation Measures.</p>
<p>Plan for the Natural Environment: Biological Resources, Policy 3.4.4: Ensures that development proposals are analyzed for short and long-term impacts on biological resources and that mitigation measures are implemented appropriately. Development occurring adjacent to biologically sensitive area will require mitigation for impacts. A City Biological Impact Fee will be applied on all development projects on vacant land to address cumulative biological impacts. The acquisition of replacement habitats will be required for the mitigation for the alkali mariposa lily.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Authority analyzed both short- and long-term impacts on biological resources, as discussed in 3.7.6, Environmental Consequences. Mitigation measures have been included to address significant impacts on biological resources. The Authority will pay any required City biological impact fees as appropriate.</p>
Lancaster Municipal Code (2019)	
<p>Section 12.20, Street Trees, Ordinance 12.20.040, 12.20.060, 12.20.080: This section of the Lancaster Municipal Code serves to protect public trees.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Authority will work with the city of Lancaster to obtain appropriate clearance for the removal of trees on public property, consistent with applicable requirements.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Environmental Resource Element (ER), Policy ER 2.1.1: Identify and preserve SEAs to the greatest extent feasible. Biological surveys should be performed to determine the nature and extent of SEA ecological significance prior to any approval of new developments.</p>	<p>Consistent. There are no SEAs in the city of Lancaster that would be affected by the six Build Alternatives. Within the city of Palmdale, each of the six Build Alternative alignments would traverse the San Andreas SEA associated with Una Lake. The Build Alternative alignments through SEAs (including the San Andreas SEA) were designed to reduce impacts and follow existing transportation corridors as much as feasible to minimize biological impacts. Furthermore, biological impacts on this SEA would be mitigated through coordination with appropriate resources agencies and implementation of IAMFs and mitigation measures (defined in Section 3.7.4.2 Section 3.7.6, respectively).</p>
<p>Environmental Resource Element (ER), Policy ER 2.1.2: Promotes only compatible and passive recreational uses in natural areas that are determined to be ecologically significant.</p>	<p>Inconsistent. All six Build Alternatives would convert portions of the San Andreas SEA associated with Una Lake to transportation-based land uses, creating inconsistency with this policy. Additionally, the Refined SR14, E1, and E2 Build Alternative alignments would traverse Una Lake on embankment and thus convert portions of Una Lake to transportation-based land use; however, the SR14A, E1A, and E2A Build Alternative alignments would be located approximately 300 feet east of Una Lake and thus avoid impacts Una Lake.</p>
<p>Environmental Resource Element (ER), Policies ER 2.1.4 and 2.1.5: Seek to preserve natural drainage courses and riparian areas and to preserve and maintain significant Joshua tree woodlands and other significant habitat areas.</p>	<p>Consistent. All six Build Alternatives would affect drainage courses, Joshua Tree woodlands, and other significant habitat areas in Palmdale. However, California HSR System design emphasized avoidance and minimization of impacts on drainage features and natural habitat areas. Furthermore, Authority would implement multiple IAMFs and mitigation measures (defined in Section 3.7.4.2 and Section 3.7.6, respectively) to preserve and maintain natural drainage courses and habitat areas (including Joshua tree woodlands) affected by the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section.</p>
<p>Environmental Resource Element (ER), Policy ER 2.2.1: Ensures local compliance and cooperation with the preparation and implementation of the <i>West Mojave Coordinated Management Plan</i> for protection of the desert tortoise and Mohave ground squirrel.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Authority would implement the best available tools and information to avoid impacts on special-status species by applying IAMFs and mitigation measures.</p>
<p>Section 12.20, Street Trees, Ordinance 12.20.040, 12.20.060, 12.20.080: This section of the Lancaster Municipal Code serves to protect public trees.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Authority will work with the city of Lancaster to obtain appropriate clearance for the removal of trees on public property, consistent with applicable requirements.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Environmental Resource Element (ER), Policy ER 2.1.1: Identify and preserve SEAs to the greatest extent feasible. Biological surveys should be performed to determine the nature and extent of SEA ecological significance prior to any approval of new developments.</p>	<p>Consistent. There are no SEAs in the city of Lancaster that would be affected by the six Build Alternatives. Within the city of Palmdale, each of the six Build Alternative alignments would traverse the San Andreas SEA associated with Una Lake. The Build Alternative alignments through SEAs (including the San Andreas SEA) were designed to reduce impacts and follow existing transportation corridors as much as feasible to minimize biological impacts. Furthermore, biological impacts on this SEA would be mitigated through coordination with appropriate resources agencies and implementation of IAMFs and mitigation measures (defined in Section 3.7.4.2 Section 3.7.6, respectively).</p>
City of Palmdale Municipal Code (2015)	
<p>Section 14, Environmental Management: Joshua Tree and Native Desert Vegetation Preservation, Ordinances 14.04.040 through 14.04.100: Seek to preserve desert vegetation to retain unique natural desert aesthetics and promote the general welfare of the community. This ordinance states that desert vegetation shall not be removed or caused to be removed from any parcel of land. All development proposal applications for a site with native desert vegetation shall include a desert vegetation preservation plan.</p>	<p>Consistent. Construction of each of the six Build Alternatives would require the removal or destruction of natural vegetation within the Build Alternative footprint that may contain desert vegetation. However, the Restoration and Revegetation Plan (BIO- MM#6) would ensure that temporarily disturbed areas be restored to pre-project conditions.</p>
Los Angeles County Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan (2012)	
<p>Conservation and Open Space Element (CO), Policy CO-10.1.2: The Santa Clara River corridor and its major tributaries shall be preserved as open space to accommodate stormwater flows and protect critical plant and animal species.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Authority would implement the best available tools and information to avoid impacts on riparian habitat and special-status species by applying IAMFs and mitigation measures for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives.</p> <p>The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not intersect the Santa Clara River within the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan jurisdiction.</p>
Burbank 2035 General Plan (2013)	
<p>Section 6 (Open Space and Conservation) of the Burbank General Plan provides policy guidance to protect, maintain, and restore plant and animal communities and habitat. However, all six Build Alternatives would only affect urbanized environments within the city of Burbank and would not substantially affect natural biological or aquatic communities within this jurisdiction.</p>	
City of Burbank Municipal Code (2019)	
<p>Section 5-1-908, Disturbing Nests of Songbirds: No person shall kill, destroy, or rob the nest of any songbird.</p>	<p>Consistent. Construction of each of the six Build Alternatives could occur during nesting season. However, BIO-MM#14 would require a pre-construction nesting bird survey and would implement site-specific measures to avoid effects active nests, thereby minimizing impacts on nesting songbirds.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Section 7-4-104, 7-4-105, 7-4-108, 7-4-111, 7-4-115, and 7-4-117 establish protocols for the maintenance, removal, and protection of trees within the city of Burbank.</p>	<p>Consistent. Construction of each of the six Build Alternatives would affect trees within the city of Burbank. However, BIO-MM#35 would compensate for impacts on protected trees and restrict construction disturbance near trees adjacent to the Build Alternative footprint, consistent with the purpose of this policy.</p>
<p>Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan (2015)</p>	
<p>The Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan is a landscape level renewable energy and conservation planning effort that covers more than 22 million acres in the California desert. The plan is a collaborative effort between BLM, USFWS, California Energy Commission, and CDFW. The plan identified two broad goals under Renewable Energy and Desert Conservation. The project is located within the extent of the draft plan but not within a specific plan-designated land use.</p>	<p>Consistent: The Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan applies to lands managed by BLM. Construction of each of the six Build Alternatives would require ground disturbance and native vegetation removal within a portion of land under BLM jurisdiction; therefore, the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan is applicable. However, the Restoration and Revegetation Plan (BIO-MM#6) would ensure that temporarily disturbed areas be restored to pre-project conditions. Implementation of each of the six Build Alternatives would require compensatory mitigation (BIO-MM#53). Acquisition of off-site mitigation lands would prioritize those areas that maximize biological resources. With the above mitigation, construction of the Build Alternatives would not interfere with wildlife values or the protection and enhancement of wildlife and plant habitat within the extent of the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan.</p>
<p>The Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan is a landscape level renewable energy and conservation planning effort that covers more than 22 million acres in the California desert. The plan is a collaborative effort between BLM, USFWS, California Energy Commission, and CDFW. The plan identified two broad goals under Renewable Energy and Desert Conservation. The project is located within the extent of the draft plan but not within a specific plan-designated land use.</p>	<p>Consistent: The Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan applies to lands managed by BLM. Construction of each of the six Build Alternatives would require ground disturbance and native vegetation removal within a portion of land under BLM jurisdiction; therefore, the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan is applicable. However, the Restoration and Revegetation Plan (BIO-MM#6) would ensure that temporarily disturbed areas be restored to pre-project conditions. Implementation of each of the six Build Alternatives would require compensatory mitigation (BIO-MM#53). Acquisition of off-site mitigation lands would prioritize those areas that maximize biological resources. With the above mitigation, construction of the Build Alternatives would not interfere with wildlife values or the protection and enhancement of wildlife and plant habitat within the extent of the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan.</p>
<p>City of Santa Clarita General Plan (2011)</p>	
<p>The City of Santa Clarita General Plan includes several policies to protect biological resources. However, the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not traverse the city of Santa Clarita, and the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would pass beneath the city of Santa Clarita in tunnel. Therefore, all six Build Alternatives would not affect sensitive ecological resources within the city of Santa Clarita and would not conflict with policies related to biological protection.</p>	

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Santa Clara River Enhancement and Management Plan (2005)	
<p>The Santa Clara River Enhancement Plan (SCREMP) is a set of policies and programs that serve to promote the preservation, enhancement, and sustainability of the Santa Clara River 500-year floodplain. Several policies in the SCREMP were identified for the purposes of encouraging, supporting, and facilitating the conservation, preservation, and enhancement of native species and habitats within the SCREMP Area. These included the preservation of existing native habitats, restoration and enhancement of habitats, aquatic habitat and wetland habitat preservation and enhancement, protection and recovery of sensitive species, and the avoidance and mitigation of impacts on biological resources.</p>	<p>Consistent. The SCREMP applies to lands within the Santa Clara River 500-year floodplain. All six Build Alternative alignments would all traverse lands within SCREMP jurisdiction and would have the potential to interfere with the conservation, preservation, and enhancement of native species and habitat as outlined in the SCREMP. However, HSR system design emphasized avoidance and minimization of impacts on natural species and habitat, including impacts that would occur within SCREMP jurisdiction. Furthermore, Authority would implement multiple IAMFs and mitigation measures (defined in Section 3.7.4.2 and Section 3.7.6, respectively) to preserve and maintain native species and habitat affected by the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, such that the preservation of existing native habitats, restoration and enhancement of habitats, aquatic habitat and wetland habitat preservation and enhancement, and protection and recovery of sensitive species would not be substantially affected.</p>
Section 3.8 Hydrology and Water Resources	
City of Palmdale General Plan (1993)	
<p>Policy ER4.1.1: Incorporate the use of flood control measures which maximize groundwater recharge and the use of floodways as native habitat.</p>	<p>Consistent: The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section's stormwater management plan would incorporate low-impact development (LID) techniques, such as constructed wetland systems, vegetated swales, and grass filter strips, where feasible, to maximize groundwater recharge.</p>
<p>Policy ER4.1.2: Restrict building coverage and total impervious area in the vicinity of natural recharge areas.</p>	<p>Consistent: Portions of the six Build Alternatives would be built in groundwater recharge areas. The Authority would create new detention facilities to maintain existing levels of groundwater recharge.</p>
<p>Policy ER4.1.3: Protect from pollutants or other materials which might degrade groundwater supplies, and enhance natural recharge areas such as the Little Rock and Big Rock Washes, and Amargosa and Anaverde Creeks, and ensure that no mineral resources recovery activities extend below the groundwater table.</p>	<p>Consistent: The Authority would implement a SWPPP and a stormwater management and treatment plan to manage stormwater runoff and pollution during construction and operations of all six Build Alternatives.</p>
<p>Policy ER4.1.5: Cooperate with the Los Angeles County Health Department and RWQCB in monitoring industrial and commercial uses utilizing hazardous or potentially polluting materials and fluids, to prevent their discharge into the groundwater aquifer.</p>	<p>Consistent: Prior to operation of the Maintenance Facility, the Authority would prepare and implement an industrial SWPPP to provide for groundwater protection per appropriate regulatory requirements (HYD-IAMF#4). In addition, HMW-IAMF#10 would require hazardous materials monitoring plans to establish procedures for the safe handling of hazardous materials during operations.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Policy PS3.1.2: Evaluate the impact of all new development and expansion of existing facilities on storm runoff and ensure that the cost of upgrading existing drainage facilities to handle the additional runoff is paid for by the development that generates it.	Consistent: HYD-IAMF#1 would reduce stormwater management impacts by evaluating each receiving stormwater system's capacity to accommodate runoff associated with each of the six Build Alternatives, identify stormwater management designed to capture runoff, and provide treatment prior to discharge of runoff from pollutant-generating surfaces.
Policy PS3.1.5: Require and provide for ongoing maintenance of drainage and detention facilities, to ensure their continued effectiveness in controlling runoff.	Consistent: The Authority would monitor and maintain Build drainage and detention facilities related to each of the six Build Alternatives throughout the lifetime of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section.
Policy PS3.2.1: Where feasible, plan for detention or retention facilities in areas where groundwater recharge can be accomplished.	Consistent: Detention and retention facilities would be designed to maintain existing levels of groundwater recharge.
Policy PS3.2.2: Where feasible, construct drainage facilities so as to protect or enhance natural riparian habitat areas.	Consistent: Drainage facilities would be designed to incorporate and protect the existing flow patterns of waterbodies in the surface hydrology and water quality RSA. Constructed wetland systems; biofiltration and bioretention systems; wet ponds; organic mulch layers; planting soil beds; and vegetated systems (biofilters), vegetated swales, and grass filter strips would be used where appropriate.
Policy S1.2.1: Require that new development not be exposed to flood hazards or contribute to an existing flood hazard, in accordance with the City's Floodplain Management Ordinance and related criteria within the City's Engineering Design Standards.	Consistent: The Authority would prepare an FPP (HYD-IAMF#2) to minimize increases in 100-year or 200-year flood elevations.
Policy S1.2.2: Require that building foundations be a minimum of 1 foot above the 100-year flood elevation unless alternative diversion methods are approved by the City Engineer.	Consistent: The Authority would prepare an FPP (HYD-IAMF#2) to minimize increases in 100-year or 200-year flood elevations.
Policy S1.2.3: Require that grading of floodways be done in a manner that allows for groundwater recharge and protection of projects from flooding.	Consistent: Floodway encroachments would be designed to minimize impacts on flood risks and groundwater recharge.
Policy S1.2.4: Require that all primary and secondary access and egress routes for all new development be "dry" access located outside of the 100-year flood plain.	Consistent: The FPP (HYD-IAMF#2) would establish design standards to allow for all six Build Alternatives to remain operational during flood events.
Policy S1.2.5: In the review of a project's design, consider the operability of natural gas, electric, water, and sewer services during the occurrence of flooding.	Consistent: The FPP (HYD-IAMF#2) would establish design standards to allow for all six Build Alternatives to remain operational during flood events.
Policy S1.2.6: Require that grading and other methods of water diversion be used to retard water runoff where appropriate.	Consistent: The stormwater management and treatment plan (HYD-IAMF#1) would incorporate LID techniques to detain runoff on site to reduce off-site runoff.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Policy S1.2.7: Ensure that stormwater drainage is designed for peak flow conditions.	Consistent: HYD- IAMF#1 would reduce stormwater management impacts by evaluating each receiving stormwater system's capacity to accommodate runoff from each of the six Build Alternatives under peak flow conditions.
Policy S1.2.8: Ensure that new development complies with floodplain zoning and watershed management regulations.	Consistent: The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would comply with State and federal regulations related to floodplains and watershed management.
Policy S1.2.9: Preserve and restore the natural and beneficial values served by floodplains to the extent feasible, consistent with public health, safety, and welfare.	Consistent: All six Build Alternatives would entail development in floodplains. However, implementation of HWR-MM#2 would restore floodplains temporarily affected by construction of each of the six Build Alternatives and would employ other measures to reduce long-term floodplain impacts.
Policy S1.2.12: Monitor and require continued maintenance of drainage basins throughout the City to ensure maximum flood protection from existing facilities and prevent downstream flood hazards.	Consistent: The Authority would monitor and maintain drainage related to all six Build Alternatives and detention facilities throughout the lifetime of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section.
<p>Floodplain Standards: Require that all development in flood hazard areas comply with state and federal regulations, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ USEO 11988, Flood Plain Management ▪ Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 as amended (Public Law 93-234) ▪ National Flood Insurance Program (44 C.F.R. Part 59-75) ▪ Floodplain Management Guidelines (43 <i>Federal Register</i> 6030) ▪ Los Angeles County Flood Control District regulations <p>Where development in flood hazard areas cannot be avoided, the proposed project or activity must be designed or modified so as to minimize the potential adverse impacts on floodplains, restore and preserve the natural and beneficial values served by floodplains, and use measures that mitigate or reduce the risk of flood loss.</p>	Consistent: The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would comply with State and federal regulations related to floodplains. In addition, the Authority would prepare an FPP to minimize increases in 100-year or 200-year flood elevations and establish design standards to allow for all six Build Alternatives to remain operational during flood events.
Palmdale Municipal Code	
Chapter 15.28 Floodplain Management: Establish requirements to protect persons and properties from flood hazards.	Consistent: The FPP (HYD-IAMF#2) would establish design standards to allow for all six Build Alternatives to remain operational during flood events.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Section 8.04.265 Chapter 70, Excavating and Grading: Regulate for the control of excavation, grading, and earthwork construction, including fills or embankments, and for the control of grading site runoff, including erosion, sediments, and construction-related pollutants. The chapter describes activities for which a permit must be obtained, the process for obtaining a permit, plans and specifications, reporting, and grading design standards.</p>	<p>Consistent: The Authority would prepare a construction-period SWPPP to minimize potential short-term increases in sediment transport caused by construction, including erosion control requirements, stormwater management, and channel dewatering for affected stream crossings.</p>
Los Angeles County General Plan (2015)	
<p>Policy M 7.1: Minimize roadway runoff through the use of permeable surface materials, and other low-impact designs, wherever feasible.</p>	<p>Consistent: The Authority would prepare a stormwater management and treatment plan (HYD-IAMF#1) and a SWPPP (HYD-IAMF#3) to manage stormwater runoff and pollution during construction and operations of all six Build Alternatives.</p>
<p>Policy C/NR 5.1: Support the LID philosophy, which seeks to plan and design public and private development with hydrologic sensitivity, including limits on straightening and channelizing natural flow paths, and removal of vegetative cover, compaction of soils, distribution of naturalistic BMPs at regional, neighborhood, and parcel-level scales.</p>	<p>Consistent: The stormwater management and treatment plan (HYD-IAMF#1) would incorporate LID techniques to detain runoff on site to reduce off-site runoff.</p>
<p>Policy C/NR 5.2: Require compliance by all county departments with adopted MS4, General Construction, and point source NPDES permits.</p>	<p>Consistent: Although the Authority is not a county department, construction of all six Build Alternatives would comply with applicable NPDES permitting.</p>
<p>Policy C/NR 5.6: Minimize point and nonpoint-source water pollution.</p>	<p>Consistent: The Authority would prepare a stormwater management and treatment plan (HYD-IAMF#1) and a SWPPP (HYD-IAMF#3) to manage stormwater runoff and pollution during construction and operations of all six Build Alternatives.</p>
<p>Policy C/NR 5.7: Actively support the design of new, and retrofit of existing, infrastructure to accommodate watershed protection goals, such as roadway, railway, bridge, and other infrastructure, particularly tributary and greenway interface points with channelized waterways.</p>	<p>Consistent: Where each of the six Build Alternatives would relocate existing infrastructure (such as roadways and railroads), the stormwater management and treatment plan (HYD-IAMF#1) would provide stormwater treatment facilities providing treatment prior to discharge of pollutant-generating surfaces.</p>
<p>Policy C/NR 6.1: Support the LID philosophy, which incorporates distributed, post-construction, parcel-level stormwater infiltration as part of new development.</p>	<p>Consistent: The stormwater management and treatment plan (HYD-IAMF#1) would implement LID techniques to detain runoff on site to reduce off-site runoff.</p>
<p>Policy C/NR 6.2: Protect natural groundwater recharge areas and regional spreading grounds.</p>	<p>Consistent: Portions of all six Build Alternatives would be built in groundwater recharge areas. The Authority would create new detention facilities to maintain existing levels of groundwater recharge.</p>
<p>Policy C/NR 6.5: Prevent stormwater infiltration where inappropriate and unsafe, such as in areas with high seasonal groundwater, on hazardous slopes, within 100 feet of drinking water wells, and in contaminated soils.</p>	<p>Consistent: The Authority would prepare a stormwater management and treatment plan (HYD-IAMF#1) and a SWPPP (HYD-IAMF#3) to manage stormwater runoff and pollution during construction and operations of all six Build Alternatives.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Policy C/NR 7.1: Support the LID philosophy, which mimics the natural hydrologic cycle using undeveloped conditions as a base, in public and private land-use planning and development design.	Consistent: The stormwater management and treatment plan (HYD-IAMF#1) would incorporate LID techniques to detain runoff on site to reduce off-site runoff.
Policy C/NR 7.3: Actively engage with stakeholders to incorporate the LID philosophy in the preparation and implementation of watershed and river master plans, ecosystem restoration projects, and other related natural resource conservation aims, and support the implementation of existing efforts, including Watershed Management Programs and Enhanced Watershed Management Programs.	Consistent: The stormwater management and treatment plan (HYD-IAMF#1) would incorporate LID techniques to detain runoff on site to reduce off-site runoff.
Policy S 2.1: Discourage development in the county's Flood Hazard Zones.	Consistent: All six Build Alternatives would involve development in Flood Hazard Areas. However, an FPP would be prepared to allow Build Alternative design to maintain operations during flood events and to minimize increases in 100-year or 200-year flood elevations.
Policy S 2.2: Discourage development from locating downslope from aqueducts.	Inconsistent for all six Build Alternatives: Like other transportation routes between Palmdale and Burbank, all six Build Alternatives would cross the Governor Edmund G Brown East Branch California Aqueduct.
Policy S 2.4: Ensure that developments located within the county's Flood Hazard Zones are sited and designed to avoid isolation from essential services and facilities in the event of flooding.	Consistent: The Authority would prepare an FPP (HYD-IAMF#2) to minimize increases in 100-year or 200-year flood elevations and establish design standards to allow for the Build Alternatives to remain operational during flood events.
Los Angeles County Code of Ordinances (2016)	
<p>Los Angeles County Code of Ordinances: Comply with the following ordinances regulating water pollution and floodplain development throughout Los Angeles County:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Title 12 Environmental Protection, Chapter 12.80 (Stormwater and Runoff Pollution Control) ▪ Title 20 Utilities, Chapter 21 (Stormwater and Runoff Pollution Control) ▪ Title 22 Planning and Zoning, Chapter 22.44.113 (Agua Dulce Community Standards District) ▪ Title 22 Planning and Zoning, Chapter 22.44.126 (Acton Community Standards District) ▪ Title 22 Planning and Zoning, Chapter 22.52 Part 5 (Flood Control) <p>Title 26 Appendix J (Grading)</p>	Consistent: The Authority would prepare a stormwater management and treatment plan (HYD-IAMF#1), a SWPPP (HYD-IAMF#3), and an FPP (HYD-IAMF#2) to manage stormwater runoff, water quality, and floodplain development pollution during construction and operations of all six Build Alternatives.
Policy LU 2.5: Except within economic opportunity areas, limit the amount of potential development in riparian areas and groundwater recharge basins, through appropriate land-use designations with very low residential densities, as indicated in the Land Use Policy Map of the Antelope Valley Area Plan.	Consistent: Although the six Build Alternatives would increase the amount of impervious surface, the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would minimize impermeable surfaces and would avoid riparian areas and groundwater recharge basins.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Policy LU 3.3: Except within economic opportunity areas, limit the amount of potential development in Flood Zones designated by FEMA through appropriate land-use designations with very low residential densities, as indicated in the Land Use Policy Map of the Antelope Valley Area Plan.</p>	<p>Inconsistent for all six Build Alternatives: The Build Alternatives would involve development in Flood Hazard Areas. However, the FPP (HYD-IAMF#2) would minimize increases in 100-year and 200-year flood elevations and establish design standards to allow for the Build Alternatives to remain operational during flood events.</p>
<p>Policy COS 2.3: Require on-site stormwater infiltration in all new developments through the use of appropriate measures, such as permeable surface coverage, permeable paving of parking and pedestrian areas, catch basins, and other low-impact development strategies.</p>	<p>Consistent: The stormwater management and treatment plan (HYD-IAMF#1) would incorporate LID techniques to detain runoff on site to reduce off-site runoff.</p>
<p>Policy COS 4.10: Restrict development that would reduce the size of waterbodies, minimizing the potential for loss of habitat and water supply.</p>	<p>Consistent: The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would result in direct loss of waterbodies but would compensate for these losses by creating waterbody mitigation areas in coordination with the appropriate resource agencies.</p>
<p>Policy COS 17.8: Require on-site stormwater infiltration in all new developments through use of appropriate measures, such as permeable surface coverage, permeable paving of parking and pedestrian areas, catch basins, and other LID strategies.</p>	<p>Consistent: The stormwater management and treatment plan (HYD-IAMF#1) would incorporate LID techniques to detain runoff on site to reduce off-site runoff.</p>
<p>Policy PSS 3.2: Require on-site stormwater filtration in all new developments through use of appropriate measures, such as permeable surface coverage, permeable paving of parking and pedestrian areas, catch basins, and other LID strategies.</p>	<p>Consistent: The stormwater management and treatment plan (HYD-IAMF#1) would incorporate LID techniques to detain runoff on site to reduce off-site runoff.</p>
<p>Policy PSS 3.3: Review the potential local and regional drainage impacts of all development proposals to minimize the need for new drainage structures.</p>	<p>Consistent: The ability of existing stormwater systems to accommodate runoff from all six Build Alternatives would be evaluated during their design.</p>

Los Angeles County Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan (2012)

This plan includes policies related to hydrology and water quality. Although the Refined SR14 Build Alternative alignment would traverse the Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area, most of these policies would not apply because the Refined SR14 Build Alternatives would be entirely underground with no surface footprint in this area. Neither the E1 Build Alternative nor the E2 Build Alternative would traverse the Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area.

The footprint of the SR14A Build Alternative would also traverse the Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area entirely underground, and neither the E1A nor E2A Build Alternative alignments would traverse the Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area.

City of Santa Clarita General Plan (2011)

This plan includes policies related to hydrology and water quality. Although the Refined SR14 Build Alternative would traverse the City of Santa Clarita, most of these policies would not apply because each of the Build Alternatives would be entirely underground with no surface footprint in this area. Neither the E1 Build Alternative nor the E2 Build Alternative would traverse the City of Santa Clarita.

The footprint of the SR14A Build Alternative alignment would also traverse the Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area entirely underground, and neither the E1A nor E2A Build Alternative alignments would traverse the Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
City of Santa Clarita Municipal Code	
<p>The City of Santa Clarita Municipal Code includes regulations related to hydrology and water quality. Although the Refined SR14 Build Alternative would traverse the City of Santa Clarita, most of these policies would not apply because each of the Build Alternatives would be entirely underground with no surface footprint in this area. Neither the E1 Build Alternative nor the E2 Build Alternative would traverse the City of Santa Clarita.</p> <p>The footprint of the SR14A Build Alternative alignment would also traverse the Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area entirely underground, and neither the E1A nor E2A Build Alternative alignments would traverse the Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area.</p>	
City of Los Angeles Municipal Code	
<p>Chapter VI Public Works and Property (Articles 4 through 4.4): Address permitting requirements for water supply quality and contamination, stormwater and urban runoff pollution control, and wastewater management.</p>	<p>Consistent: The Authority would prepare a stormwater management and treatment plan (HYD-IAMF#1) and a SWPPP (HYD-IAMF#3) to manage stormwater runoff and pollution during construction and operations of each of the six Build Alternatives.</p>
Angeles National Forest Land Management Plan (2005)	
<p>Strategy WAT 1 – Watershed Function: Protect, maintain, and restore natural watershed functions, including slope processes, surface water and groundwater flow and retention, and riparian area sustainability.</p>	<p>Consistent: The Authority would prepare a stormwater management and treatment plan (HYD-IAMF#1) and a SWPPP (HYD-IAMF#3) to manage stormwater runoff and pollution during construction and operations of each of the six Build Alternatives.</p>
<p>Strategy WAT 2 – Water Management: Manage groundwater and surface water to maintain or improve water quantity and quality in ways that minimize adverse effects.</p>	<p>Consistent: USFS is a cooperating agency on the HSR system and must approve a special use authorization to construct the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section within ANF including SGMNM. As part of the special use authorization process, USFS would evaluate groundwater effects and work with the Authority to avoid, minimize, or mitigate identified impacts.</p>
<p>36 C.F.R. 219 Plan Standard S45: For all construction, reconstruction, operation, and maintenance of tunnels on National Forest System lands, use practices that minimize adverse effects on groundwater aquifers and their surface expressions.</p>	<p>Consistent: All six Build Alternatives would entail construction and operations of tunnels beneath ANF including SGMNM. Implementation of HWR-MM#4 would prescribe measures to minimize the potential for groundwater drawdown caused by tunnel boring.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>36 C.F.R. 219, Plan Standard S46: Surface water diversions and groundwater extractions, including wells and spring developments, will only be authorized when it is demonstrated by the user, and/or agreed to by the Forest Service, that the water extracted is excess to the current and reasonably foreseeable future needs of forest resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consideration of beneficial uses, existing water rights, and the absence of other available water sources will be part of the water extraction application. ▪ Approved extractions and diversions will provide for long-term protection and reasonable use of surface water and groundwater resources. <p>Feasibility and sustainability assessments should be appropriately scaled to the magnitude of the extraction or diversion proposed.</p>	<p>Consistent: Dewatering may be required during both construction and operations of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, which could result in drawdown of the water table within groundwater basins traversed by each of the six Build Alternative alignments. Water levels of wells in the vicinity of the tunneled alignment could also be affected during construction and operations. In addition, construction and operations of all six Build Alternatives would require water supplied by local water purveyors, which could rely on local groundwater aquifers. Thus, groundwater withdrawal could increase due to construction and operations of all six Build Alternatives. Section 3.6 analyzes the impacts of water demand associated with the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section.</p>
Burbank 2035 General Plan (2013)	
<p>Policy 9.5: Require on-site drainage improvements using native vegetation to capture and clean stormwater runoff.</p>	<p>Consistent: The stormwater management and treatment plan (HYD-IAMF#1) would incorporate LID techniques to detain runoff on site to reduce off-site runoff.</p>
<p>Policy 6.7: Employ strategies and design features to reduce the area of impervious surface in new development projects.</p>	<p>Consistent: The stormwater management and treatment plan (HYD-IAMF#1) would incorporate LID techniques to detain runoff on site to reduce off-site runoff.</p>
<p>Program COS-9 Regional Water Consultation: Achieve the following water supply, distribution, and conservation objectives for this ongoing program administered by Burbank Water and Power and the Community Development Department (in consultation with Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and Los Angeles RWQCB):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintain groundwater recharge areas to protect water quality and ensure continued recharge of local groundwater basins. ▪ Maintain water quality objectives for urban runoff. <p>Comply with all provisions of the NPDES permit and support regional efforts by the Los Angeles RWQCB to improve and protect surface water quality.</p>	<p>Consistent: The stormwater management and treatment plan (HYD-IAMF#1) and construction-period SWPPP (HYD-IAMF#3) would minimize impacts on water quality while maximizing groundwater recharge through the use of constructed wetland systems, bioretention systems, vegetated swales, and other methods. Drainage systems would be designed to maintain existing drainage and flood patterns.</p>
City of Burbank Municipal Code (2019)	
<p>Burbank Municipal Code Title 7 Public Ways and Properties, Chapter 1 Excavations: Establish minimum requirements for grading, fills, and excavations and the prevention of environmental and other damage in order to safeguard life, health, property, and the public welfare.</p>	<p>Consistent: BMPs limiting impacts on water quality and flood safety would be implemented during construction of all six Build Alternatives to minimize environmental and other damage from grading and excavation activities.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Title 9 Building Regulations, Chapter 3 Environmental Protection, Article 4 Standard Urban Storm Water and Urban Runoff Management Programs: Comply with applicable NPDES permitting requirements described in the NPDES program, the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity, required BMPs, permit issuance, adoption of the “Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan for Los Angeles County and Cities in Los Angeles,” and stormwater pollution control measures for development planning.</p>	<p>Consistent: Construction of all six Build Alternatives would comply with applicable NPDES permitting. A SWPPP and stormwater management and treatment plan would be implemented to manage stormwater runoff during construction and operations of all six Build Alternatives.</p>
<p>Section 3.9 Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources</p>	
<p>Los Angeles County General Plan (2015)</p>	
<p>Policy S1.1: Discourage development in Seismic Hazard and Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones.</p>	<p>Consistent: Like other transportation routes in the region, the California HSR System would be in an area with moderate to severe seismic hazards, including Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones. Fault rupture, ground shaking, and other seismic hazards would be considered and addressed during design and engineering of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section to ensure safe HSR construction and operations under the anticipated seismic conditions.</p>
<p>Policy S1.2: Prohibit construction of most structures for human occupancy adjacent to active faults until a comprehensive fault study is completed.</p>	<p>Consistent: The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would not create structures for permanent human occupancy on or across fault traces. Furthermore, design, engineering, and construction of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would entail a comprehensive seismic analysis to ensure that the California HSR System can withstand seismic forces within established safety standards.</p>
<p>Policy S1.3: Require developments to mitigate geotechnical hazards, such as soil instability and landsliding, in Hillside Management Areas through siting and development standards.</p>	<p>Consistent: The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would incorporate IAMFs to avoid and reduce geologic and seismic hazards, including unstable soils and slopes (see Section 3.9.4.2).</p>
<p>Policy C/NR, 10.1: Protect MRZ-2s and access to MRZ-2s from development and discourage inconsistent adjacent land uses.</p>	<p>Inconsistent for all six Build Alternatives: The Build Alternative footprint for each of the six Build Alternatives would overlie MRZ-2 areas (defined in Section 3.9.2.2), which would reduce access but could also permanently limit mineral resources recovery in these areas. However, the MRZ-2 impacted by each of the Build Alternatives would be minimal as discussed in Section 3.9.6.3. Where the project would result in inconsistent land uses with existing mining facilities, mines would be closed, and the Authority would compensate lease owners for potential losses of available mineral resources. However, the loss of access to MRZ-2s where the HSR system’s proposed permanent footprint would be unavoidable.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Policy C/NR, 10.5: Manage mineral resources in a manner that effectively plans for access to, and development and conservation of, mineral resources for existing and future generations.</p>	<p>Inconsistent for all six Build Alternatives: Each of the six Build Alternative footprints would overlie MRZ-2 and MRZ-3 areas (defined in Section 3.9.2.2), which could reduce access to mineral resources recovery in these areas. Where the project would result in inconsistent land uses with existing mining facilities, this analysis assumes that mines would be closed, and the Authority would compensate lease owners for potential losses of available mineral resources. Continued access to existing mineral operations and MRZs would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis in coordination with the property owner.</p>
<p>Policy C/NR, 10.6: Require that new non-mining land uses adjacent to existing mining operations be designed to provide a buffer between the new development and the mining operations.</p>	<p>Potentially Consistent for all six Build Alternatives: Each of the six Build Alternative footprints encompass active and inactive mining facilities (described in Section 3.9.5.8). The Build Alternatives would also be located within 0.5 mile of multiple active and inactive mining operations. Where the project would result in inconsistent land uses with existing mining facilities, this analysis assumes that mines would be closed, and the Authority would compensate lease owners for potential losses of available mineral resources. However, continued access to existing mineral operations would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis in coordination with the mine owner.</p>
<p>Policy C/NR 14.1: Mitigate all impacts from new development on or adjacent to historic, cultural, and paleontological resources to the greatest extent feasible.</p>	<p>Consistent: GEO-IAMF#11 through GEO-IAMF#15 would protect paleontological resources to the greatest extent feasible.</p>
<p>Policy C/NR 14.6: Ensure proper notification and recovery processes are carried out for development on or near historic, cultural, and paleontological resources.</p>	<p>Consistent: GEO-IAMF#11 through GEO-IAMF#15 would protect paleontological resources to the greatest extent feasible.</p>
<p>Los Angeles County Antelope Valley Area Plan 2035 (2015)</p>	
<p>Policy PS 1.1: Limit the amount of potential development in Seismic Zones and along the San Andreas Fault and other fault traces.</p>	<p>Consistent: Although the California HSR System would involve facilities that would be adjacent to and would cross active faults, including the San Andreas Fault Zone, the Authority would assess seismic hazards and implement proper mitigation and safeguards prior to construction.</p>
<p>Policy PS 2.2: Limit development on steep slopes and within landslide and liquefaction areas.</p>	<p>Consistent: Although construction of all Six Build Alternatives would entail development within steep slopes and known landslide and liquefaction areas, IAMF implementation would reduce these potential geotechnical hazards.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Policy PS 2.3: Prohibit construction of new structures on or across a fault trace.	Inconsistent for all six Build Alternatives: All six Build Alternative alignments would cross fault traces. However, there is no feasible routing between Palmdale and Burbank that does not cross one or more identified faults. Fault rupture, ground shaking, and other seismic hazards would be considered and addressed during project design and engineering to ensure safe HSR construction and operations under the anticipated seismic conditions. Additionally, the project would not create structures for permanent human occupancy on or across fault traces.
Policy PS 2.4: Ensure new development does not cause or contribute to slope instability.	Consistent: GEO-IAMF#1, GEO-IAMF#2, and GEO-IAMF#10 would avoid causing or contributing to slope instability.
Los Angeles County Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan (2012)	
Section L, page S-38: Identify seismic hazard zones and requirements for seismic design.	Consistent: Design, engineering, and construction of the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would entail a comprehensive seismic analysis to ensure that the HSR system can withstand seismic forces within accepted safety standards. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not be in areas governed by the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan.
Section L, page S-38: Identify and mitigate hazards from soil instability through identification of hazard areas.	Consistent: The Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives includes IAMFs to require identification of soil instability areas and implementation of engineering guidelines to reduce slope instability hazards. The E1 and E2 Build Alternatives would not be constructed through areas governed by the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan.
Objective S1.1: Identify and map areas in the Santa Clarita Valley that are susceptible to geological hazards.	Consistent: IAMFs would require identification of relevant portions of the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives that would be susceptible to geological hazards. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not be in areas governed by the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan.
Objective S1.2: Regulate new development in areas subject to geological hazards to reduce risks to the public from seismic events or geological instability.	Consistent: Implementation of IAMFs would ensure avoidance and minimization of geologic and seismic hazards during construction and operations of the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternative. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not be in areas governed by the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan.
Objective S1.3: Reduce risk of damage in developed areas from seismic activity.	Consistent: Design, engineering, and construction of the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would include comprehensive seismic analyses to ensure that the HSR system can withstand seismic forces within accepted safety standards. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not be in areas governed by the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
City of Palmdale General Plan (1993)	
Objective S1.1: Review development within or adjacent to geologic hazards, to ensure adequate provisions for public safety.	Consistent: The Authority would evaluate possible geologic hazards and implement appropriate mitigation measures to reduce risk to life, property, and resources.
Policy S2.1.2: Evaluate the potential for inundation from failure of infrastructure, including the Lake Palmdale dam.	Consistent: The Authority would evaluate the potential for inundation from failure of the nearby Palmdale Dam.
Policy ER7.1.3: Require that new development protect significant historic, paleontological, or archaeological resources, or provide for other appropriate mitigation.	Consistent: GEO-IAMF#11 through GEO-IAMF#15 would protect paleontological resources to the greatest extent feasible.
City of Los Angeles General Plan (2001)	
Policy 1.1.6: Assure compliance with applicable State and federal planning and development regulations, including the Alquist-Priolo Act and the State Mapping Act.	Consistent: The Authority would ensure compliance with applicable State and federal planning and development regulations.
City of Burbank 2035 General Plan (2013)	
Program S-4: Evaluate the liquefaction potential of a site when shallow groundwater (50 feet or less below ground) and unconsolidated sandy alluvium soils are found.	Consistent: Comprehensive soil analysis conducted during development of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would identify potential liquefaction hazards.
Program S-4: Encourage fault investigations in the Verdugo Fault zone.	Consistent: The construction contractor would investigate seismic risks associated with the Verdugo Fault zone and incorporate design measures to ensure safe HSR operations under anticipated seismic conditions.
Program S-6: Verify that new development complies with the California Building Standards Code seismic design standards.	Consistent: Although the California HSR System is a federal and State undertaking, the Authority would implement design standards from the most current California Building Code.
Section 3.10 Hazardous Materials and Wastes	
City of Lancaster General Plan 2030 (2009)	
Policy 4.5.1(a): Ensure implementation of Los Angeles County Certified Unified Program Agency policies and goals through the environmental review process.	Consistent. The Authority and its contractors would follow local policies and goals from the County Certified Unified Program.
City of Palmdale General Plan (1993)	
Public Services (PS) Element, Policy PS6.2.4: Facilitate compliance with regulations requiring the preparation of Hazardous Materials Management Plans and Risk Management Prevention Plans, as applicable to handlers of specified hazardous materials and acutely hazardous materials.	Consistent. The Authority would prepare plans outlining hazardous materials storage, use, and disposal procedures associated with both construction and operations. These include a spill protection, control, and countermeasure (SPCC plan), a construction management plan (CMP), and hazardous materials monitoring plans.
Public Services (PS) Element, Policy PS6.2.6: Support the regulation and enforcement of hazardous waste laws governing the generation, handling, storage, transport, treatment, and disposal of hazardous waste.	Consistent. The Authority and its contractors would follow pertinent federal and State regulations governing the generation, handling, storage, transport, treatment, and disposal of hazardous waste.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Safety (S) Element, Policy S2.3.3: Requires that soils containing toxic or hazardous substances be cleaned up to the satisfaction of the agency having jurisdiction, prior to the granting of any permits for new development.</p>	<p>Consistent. As discussed in HMW-HMW-IAMF#1, the Authority would conduct site investigations to determine the presence of hazardous conditions. Remediation or corrective action (e.g., removal of contamination, in situ treatment, or soil capping) would be conducted with State and local agency officials (as necessary) and in full compliance with applicable State and federal regulations.</p>
<p>Safety (S) Element, Policy S2.3.7: Review proposed development in proximity to any existing or proposed hazardous waste facility to ensure that future development and land use decisions consider and incorporate site design, setbacks and buffering techniques appropriate for the site, and that they provide adequate mitigation of any adverse impacts on such development from hazardous waste facilities.</p>	<p>Consistent. As discussed in HMW-IAMF#1, the Authority would conduct site investigations to determine the presence of hazardous conditions. Remediation or corrective action (e.g., removal of contamination, in situ treatment, or soil capping) would be conducted with State and local agency officials (as necessary) and in full compliance with applicable State and federal regulations.</p>
Los Angeles County Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan (2012)	
<p>Policy S-4.1.2: Coordinate with other agencies to address contamination of soil and groundwater from hazardous materials on various sites; require that contamination be cleaned up to the satisfaction of the county and other responsible agencies prior to issuance of any permits for new development.</p>	<p>Consistent. For the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives, the Authority would coordinate with appropriate agencies to conduct hazardous materials and waste cleanup and reclamation activities. These policies do not apply to the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives because they would not pass through the Santa Clarita Valley area.</p>
<p>Policy S-4.2.3: Require businesses to verify procedures for storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials.</p>	<p>Consistent. For the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternative, the Authority would prepare several plans outlining hazardous materials storage, use, and disposal procedures. These include an SPCC plan, a CMP, and hazardous materials monitoring plans. These policies do not apply to the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives because they would not pass through the Santa Clarita Valley area.</p>
Burbank 2035 General Plan (2013)	
<p>Policy 8.5: Consult with appropriate agencies regarding hazardous materials regulations.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Authority and its contractors would follow pertinent federal, State, and local agencies governing the generation, handling, storage, transport, treatment, and disposal of hazardous waste.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Section 3.11 Safety and Security	
City of Lancaster General Plan (2009)	
<p>The City of Lancaster General Plan includes a Plan for Public Health and Safety. This consists of an evaluation of relevant natural and human-made hazards and provides a program to reduce associated risks. The plan addresses the following issues: geology and seismicity, flooding and drainage, noise, air installation land use compatibility, hazardous materials, crime prevention and protection services, fire prevention and suppression services, disaster preparedness, and emergency medical facilities.</p>	<p>Consistent. As discussed in Section 3.9, Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources, the Authority would ensure that detailed geologic investigations are conducted with the guidelines of the California Geologic Survey and all human occupancy adjacent to an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone would be designated to applicable standards for these areas.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, with implementation of SS-IAMF#1 and SS-IAMF#2, the contractor will prepare a Construction Safety Transportation Plan which describes the contractor's coordination efforts with local jurisdictions for maintaining emergency vehicle access during construction of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, and a Safety and Security Management Plan which includes construction safety and security plans to establish minimum safety and security guidelines during construction and fire/life safety and security programs that address the safety of passengers and employees during emergency response.</p>
City of Lancaster Emergency Operations Plan (2010)	
<p>This plan provides recommendations and suggestions intended to improve emergency preparedness, response, and recovery within the City of Lancaster, and provides a threat assessment for the city.</p>	<p>Consistent. Per S&S-MM#1, the Authority will enter into an agreement with the public service providers of fire, police, and emergency services to fund the Authority's fair share of services demand.</p>
City of Lancaster Hazard Mitigation Plan (2013)	
<p>This plan provides a list of activities designed to assist the City of Lancaster with reducing risk and preventing losses from future hazard events. The plan's strategies address multi-hazard issues, as well as hazard-specific activities for windstorms, earthquakes, fires, flood, landslide, and terrorism.</p>	<p>Consistent. Per S&S-MM#1, the Authority will enter into an agreement with the public service providers of fire, police, and emergency services to fund the Authority's fair share of services demand.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
City of Palmdale General Plan (1993)	
<p>The Palmdale General Plan acknowledges a number of natural and human-made hazards which constrain development. The Safety Element of the General Plan provides a comprehensive risk management program to serve as a guide for the day-to-day operational decisions of City staff and seeks to eliminate or reduce the risks to public safety through planning for the prevention of hazardous situations and for the provision of adequate emergency services.</p>	<p>Consistent. As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, with implementation of SS-IAMF#1 and SS-IAMF#2, the contractor will prepare a Construction Safety Transportation Plan which describes the contractor’s coordination efforts with local jurisdictions for maintaining emergency vehicle access during construction of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, and a Safety and Security Management Plan which includes construction safety and security plans to establish minimum safety and security guidelines during construction and fire/life safety and security programs that address the safety of passengers and employees during emergency response.</p> <p>Per S&S-MM#1, the Authority will enter into an agreement with the public service providers of fire, police, and emergency services to fund the Authority’s fair share of services demand.</p>
Plant 10 Palmdale Specific Plan (1992)	
<p>This specific plan identifies five main sources of hazards in the planning area: aircraft operations and the resultant U.S. Air Force (USAF) Plant 42 Air Installation Compatible Use Zone, potential seismic activity, potential flood inundation, hazardous material chemical release, and ground vibration from railway activity. The plan incorporates strategies for averting these hazards in the planning and construction of future structures.</p>	<p>Consistent. As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, with implementation of SS-IAMF#1 and SS-IAMF#2, the contractor will prepare a Construction Safety Transportation Plan which describes the contractor’s coordination efforts with local jurisdictions for maintaining emergency vehicle access during construction of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, and a Safety and Security Management Plan which includes construction safety and security plans to establish minimum safety and security guidelines during construction and fire/life safety and security programs that address the safety of passengers and employees during emergency response.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Palmdale Transit Village Specific Plan (2007)	
<p>The Palmdale Transit Village Specific Plan establishes a framework for transit-oriented development in the Palmdale Transit Center area. The plan addresses fire safety as well as pedestrian and cyclist safety.</p>	<p>Consistent. As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, with implementation of SS-IAMF#1 and SS-IAMF#2, the contractor will prepare a Construction Safety Transportation Plan which describes the contractor’s coordination efforts with local jurisdictions for maintaining emergency vehicle access during construction of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, and a Safety and Security Management Plan which includes construction safety and security plans to establish minimum safety and security guidelines during construction and fire/life safety and security programs that address the safety of passengers and employees during emergency response.</p> <p>Additionally, as discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section will be constructed to minimize injuries and loss of life as well as property damage compatible with applicable plans, policies, and requirements.</p>
City of Palmdale Emergency Operations Plan (2012)	
<p>This plan addresses the City of Palmdale’s response to natural and technological disasters. It provides an overview of operational concepts; identifies components of the city’s emergency/disaster management organization within the Standardized Emergency Management System; and describes the overall responsibilities of the federal, state and county entities and the city for protecting life and property and assuring the overall well-being of the population.</p>	<p>Consistent. Per S&S-MM#1, the Authority will enter into an agreement with the public service providers of fire, police, and emergency services to fund the Authority’s fair share of services demand.</p> <p>Additionally, as discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section will be constructed to minimize injuries and loss of life as well as property damage compatible with applicable plans, policies, and requirements.</p>
City of Palmdale Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (2015)	
<p>This plan is designed to ensure that the long-term values of the community are not compromised in the course of preparing for, responding to, or recovering from natural and human-made hazards.</p>	<p>Consistent. Per S&S-MM#1, the Authority will enter into an agreement with the public service providers of fire, police, and emergency services to fund the Authority’s fair share of services demand.</p>
Palmdale Municipal Code (2019)	
<p>Chapter 2.28: Civil Defense and Disasters of the Palmdale Municipal Code provides for the preparation and execution of plans for the protection of persons and property within the city in the event of an emergency; the direction of the emergency organization; and the coordination of the emergency functions of the City with other public agencies, corporations, organizations and private persons.</p>	<p>Consistent. As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, with implementation of SS-IAMF#1 and SS-IAMF#2, the contractor will prepare a Construction Safety Transportation Plan which describes the contractor’s coordination efforts with local jurisdictions for maintaining emergency vehicle access during construction of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, and a Safety and Security Management Plan which includes construction safety and security plans to establish minimum safety and security guidelines during construction and fire/life safety and security programs that address the safety of passengers and employees during emergency response.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
City of Santa Clarita Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (2015)	
<p>This plan contains resources and information to assist residents, public and private sector organizations, and others with planning for the occurrence of natural and human-made disasters, including earthquakes, flood, hazardous materials, landslides, severe weather, and wildfires.</p>	<p>Consistent. Per S&S-MM#1, the Authority will enter into an agreement with the public service providers of fire, police, and emergency services to fund the Authority's fair share of services demand.</p>
City of Los Angeles General Plan (1996)	
<p>This Safety Element provides a contextual framework for understanding the relationship between hazard mitigation, response to a natural disaster, and initial recovery from a natural disaster. As such, the element includes goals and policies related to hazard mitigation, emergency response, and disaster recovery. The Safety Element does not address police matters except in relation to natural disasters.</p>	<p>Consistent. As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, with implementation of SS-IAMF#1 and SS-IAMF#2, the contractor will prepare a Construction Safety Transportation Plan which describes the contractor's coordination efforts with local jurisdictions for maintaining emergency vehicle access during construction of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, and a Safety and Security Management Plan which includes construction safety and security plans to establish minimum safety and security guidelines during construction and fire/life safety and security programs that address the safety of passengers and employees during emergency response.</p> <p>Per S&S-MM#1, the Authority will enter into an agreement with the public service providers of fire, police, and emergency services to fund the Authority's fair share of services demand.</p>
Arleta-Pacoima Community Plan (1996) (Part of the City of Los Angeles General Plan)	
<p>The Arleta Pacoima Community Plan promotes an arrangement of land uses, streets, and services which will encourage and contribute to the physical health and safety of the people who live and work in the community. The plan is also intended to guide development to create a healthful and pleasant environment. Specifically, this plan addresses safety concerns related to the proximity of trains to the population.</p>	<p>Consistent. As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, with implementation of SS-IAMF#1 and SS-IAMF#2, the contractor will prepare a Construction Safety Transportation Plan which describes the contractor's coordination efforts with local jurisdictions for maintaining emergency vehicle access during construction of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, and a Safety and Security Management Plan which includes construction safety and security plans to establish minimum safety and security guidelines during construction and fire/life safety and security programs that address the safety of passengers and employees during emergency response.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace-Shadow Hills-East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan (1997) (Part of the City of Los Angeles General Plan)	
<p>This community plan establishes policies to improve safety and security in parking areas, commercial areas, and areas where industrial and residential areas are adjacent. The plan also seeks to establish a comprehensive fire and life safety program.</p>	<p>Consistent. As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, with implementation of SS-IAMF#1 and SS-IAMF#2, the contractor will prepare a Construction Safety Transportation Plan which describes the contractor's coordination efforts with local jurisdictions for maintaining emergency vehicle access during construction of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, and a Safety and Security Management Plan which includes construction safety and security plans to establish minimum safety and security guidelines during construction and fire/life safety and security programs that address the safety of passengers and employees during emergency response.</p>
Sylmar Community Plan (1997) (Part of the City of Los Angeles General Plan)	
<p>This community plan supports the creation of a safe atmosphere for pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians. The plan also specifies a land use plan for avoiding damage caused by natural disasters such as wildfires, mudslides, and flooding.</p>	<p>Consistent. As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, with implementation of SS-IAMF#1 and SS-IAMF#2, the contractor will prepare a Construction Safety Transportation Plan which describes the contractor's coordination efforts with local jurisdictions for maintaining emergency vehicle access during construction of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, and a Safety and Security Management Plan which includes construction safety and security plans to establish minimum safety and security guidelines during construction and fire/life safety and security programs that address the safety of passengers and employees during emergency response.</p>
Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon Community Plan (1999) (Part of the City of Los Angeles General Plan)	
<p>This community plan establishes goals and policies that seek to improve safety for pedestrians and drivers in commercial areas and where industrial and residential areas are adjacent. This plan also seeks to establish a comprehensive fire and life safety program. Another goal of the plan is to set aside enough open space in balance with new development to serve the health and safety needs of the community.</p>	<p>Consistent. As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, with implementation of SS-IAMF#1 and SS-IAMF#2, the contractor will prepare a Construction Safety Transportation Plan which describes the contractor's coordination efforts with local jurisdictions for maintaining emergency vehicle access during construction of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, and a Safety and Security Management Plan which includes construction safety and security plans to establish minimum safety and security guidelines during construction and fire/life safety and security programs that address the safety of passengers and employees during emergency response.</p>
City of Los Angeles Municipal Code (2019)	
<p>Chapter 5: Public Safety and Protection of the City of the Los Angeles Municipal Code addresses police and special officers (Article 2), public hazards (Article 6), and fire protection and prevention (Article 7).</p>	<p>Consistent. Per S&S-MM#1, the Authority will enter into an agreement with the public service providers of fire, police, and emergency services to fund the Authority's fair share of services demand.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
City of Los Angeles Emergency Operations Plan (2018)	
<p>The Emergency Operations Plan for the City of Los Angeles addressed the city's response functions and capabilities regarding small- to large- scale emergency situations associated with natural disasters of human-caused emergencies. The plan describes the methods for carrying out emergency operations, the process for rendering mutual aid, the emergency services of governmental departments and agencies, how resources are mobilized, how the public will be informed, and the process to ensure continuity of government during an emergency or disaster.</p>	<p>Consistent. Per S&S-MM#1, the Authority will enter into an agreement with the public service providers of fire, police, and emergency services to fund the Authority's fair share of services demand.</p>
Burbank 2035 General Plan (2013)	
<p>The Safety Element of Burbank's 2035 General Plan provides tools to address threats like natural and human-caused hazards. The element is meant to guide future planning decisions that must be considered in the context of natural hazards, such as earthquakes and floods, as well as the provision of police, fire, and emergency medical services.</p>	<p>Consistent. As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, with implementation of SS-IAMF#1 and SS-IAMF#2, the contractor will prepare a Construction Safety Transportation Plan which describes the contractor's coordination efforts with local jurisdictions for maintaining emergency vehicle access during construction of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, and a Safety and Security Management Plan which includes construction safety and security plans to establish minimum safety and security guidelines during construction and fire/life safety and security programs that address the safety of passengers and employees during emergency response.</p> <p>Per S&S-MM#1, the Authority will enter into an agreement with the public service providers of fire, police, and emergency services to fund the Authority's fair share of services demand.</p>
City of Burbank Municipal Code (2019)	
<p>Chapter 2: Disasters, provides for the preparation and execution of plans for the protection of persons and property within Burbank in the event of an emergency; the direction of the emergency organization; and coordination of the emergency functions of the city with all other agencies, corporations, organizations, and affected private persons.</p>	<p>Consistent. As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, with implementation of SS-IAMF#1 and SS-IAMF#2, the contractor will prepare a Construction Safety Transportation Plan which describes the contractor's coordination efforts with local jurisdictions for maintaining emergency vehicle access during construction of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, and a Safety and Security Management Plan which includes construction safety and security plans to establish minimum safety and security guidelines during construction and fire/life safety and security programs that address the safety of passengers and employees during emergency response.</p> <p>Per S&S-MM#1, the Authority will enter into an agreement with the public service providers of fire, police, and emergency services to fund the Authority's fair share of services demand.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
City of Burbank Consolidated Contingency Plan (2001)	
<p>The Consolidated Contingency Plan provides a business format to comply with the emergency planning requirements of emergency response plans applicable to California.</p>	<p>Consistent. Per S&S-MM#1, the Authority will enter into an agreement with the public service providers of fire, police, and emergency services to fund the Authority's fair share of services demand.</p>
City of Burbank Multi-Hazard Functional Plan (2009)	
<p>This plan addresses the City's planned response to emergencies associated with natural disasters and technological incidents, including both peacetime and wartime nuclear defense operations.</p>	<p>Consistent. Per S&S-MM#1, the Authority will enter into an agreement with the public service providers of fire, police, and emergency services to fund the Authority's fair share of services demand.</p>
City of Burbank All-Hazard Mitigation Plan (2011)	
<p>This plan provides a framework for the identification and coordination of hazard mitigation strategies developed in the City of Burbank with other plans. Its purpose is to integrate hazard mitigation strategies into the day-to-day activities and programs of the City of Burbank.</p>	<p>Consistent. Per S&S-MM#1, the Authority will enter into an agreement with the public service providers of fire, police, and emergency services to fund the Authority's fair share of services demand.</p>
Los Angeles County General Plan 2035: Safety Element (2015)	
<p>The Safety Element of this plan addresses limited aspects of human-made disasters, such as hazardous waste and materials management. In particular, the plan addresses those aspects related to seismic events, fires, and floods.</p>	<p>Consistent. As discussed in Section 3.9, Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources, the Authority would ensure that detailed geologic investigations are conducted in conformance with the guidelines of the California Geologic Survey and all human occupancy adjacent to an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone would be designed to applicable standards for these areas.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, with implementation of SS-IAMF#1 and SSIAMF#2, the contractor will prepare a Construction Safety Transportation Plan which describes the contractor's coordination efforts with local jurisdictions for maintaining emergency vehicle access during construction of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section and a SSMP which includes construction safety and security plans to establish minimum safety and security guidelines during construction and fire/life safety and security programs that address the safety of passengers and employees during emergency response.</p> <p>Per S&S-MM#1, the Authority will enter into an agreement with the public service providers of fire, police, and emergency services to fund the Authority's fair share of services demand.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Los Angeles County Antelope Valley Area Plan 2035 (2015)	
<p>This area plan includes a policy framework for the preservation of public health, safety, and welfare through the identification of natural and environmental hazards, including noise, seismic, fire, and airborne emissions, and designation of land uses in an appropriate manner to mitigate these impacts.</p>	<p>Consistent. As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, with implementation of SS-IAMF#1 and SS-IAMF#2, the contractor will prepare a Construction Safety Transportation Plan which describes the contractor's coordination efforts with local jurisdictions for maintaining emergency vehicle access during construction of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, and a Safety and Security Management Plan which includes construction safety and security plans to establish minimum safety and security guidelines during construction and fire/life safety and security programs that address the safety of passengers and employees during emergency response.</p>
Los Angeles County Operation Area Emergency Response Plan (1998)	
<p>Section 5, Los Angeles County Hazards Analysis and Mitigation, of this document describes and prioritizes local hazard mitigation plans. The plan describes threats faced by Los Angeles County's various communities and establishes strategies to reduce and eliminate known risks.</p>	<p>Consistent. As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, with implementation of SS-IAMF#1 and SS-IAMF#2, the contractor will prepare a Construction Safety Transportation Plan which describes the contractor's coordination efforts with local jurisdictions for maintaining emergency vehicle access during construction of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, and a Safety and Security Management Plan which includes construction safety and security plans to establish minimum safety and security guidelines during construction and fire/life safety and security programs that address the safety of passengers and employees during emergency response.</p>
Los Angeles County All-Hazard Mitigation Plan (2019)	
<p>This plan provides local governments with guidance on ways to effectively meet disaster management regulations. The document includes implementation examples, as well as suggestions on conducting a plan update process.</p>	<p>Consistent. As discussed in Section 3.9, Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources, the Authority would ensure that detailed geologic investigations are conducted with the guidelines of the California Geologic Survey and all human occupancy adjacent to an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone would be designated to applicable standards for these areas.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, with implementation of SS-IAMF#1 and SS-IAMF#2, the contractor will prepare a Construction Safety Transportation Plan which describes the contractor's coordination efforts with local jurisdictions for maintaining emergency vehicle access during construction of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, and a Safety and Security Management Plan which includes construction safety and security plans to establish minimum safety and security guidelines during construction and fire/life safety and security programs that address the safety of passengers and employees during emergency response.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Los Angeles County Strategic Plan for Emergency Management (2014)	
This plan provides a framework for enhancing emergency preparedness, maintaining the continuity of government operations during a disaster, and emergency management training.	Consistent. Per S&S-MM#1, the Authority will enter into an agreement with the public service providers of fire, police, and emergency services to fund the Authority's fair share of services demand.
Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan (2004)	
The Airport Land Use Plan establishes uniform policies and standards that prohibit the development of incompatible land uses in the areas adjacent to the public use airports in Los Angeles County, including the Hollywood Burbank Airport and Whiteman Airport. However, it is the responsibility of the cities and the County, through planning and zoning powers, to specify which compatible uses are appropriate within their jurisdictions. The Airport Land Use Plan sets forth policies related to safety, noise insulation, and the regulation of building height.	Consistent. As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, with implementation of SS-IAMF#1 and SS-IAMF#2, the contractor will prepare a Construction Safety Transportation Plan which describes the contractor's coordination efforts with local jurisdictions for maintaining emergency vehicle access during construction of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, and a Safety and Security Management Plan which includes construction safety and security plans to establish minimum safety and security guidelines during construction and fire/life safety and security programs that address the safety of passengers and employees during emergency response.
SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan (2008)	
This plan establishes a framework for achieving security and emergency preparedness across the project region and with regards to the safety of inter-regional transportation projects.	Consistent. As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, with implementation of SS-IAMF#1 and SS-IAMF#2, the contractor will prepare a Construction Safety Transportation Plan which describes the contractor's coordination efforts with local jurisdictions for maintaining emergency vehicle access during construction of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, and a Safety and Security Management Plan which includes construction safety and security plans to establish minimum safety and security guidelines during construction and fire/life safety and security programs that address the safety of passengers and employees during emergency response.
SCAG Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy: Transportation Safety and Security (2016)	
This plan outlines strategies to ensure the safety and mobility of the region's residents, including drivers and passengers, transit drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists.	Consistent. As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section will be constructed to minimize injuries and loss of life as well as property damage compatible with applicable plans, policies, and requirements.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Section 3.12 Socioeconomics and Communities	
City of Palmdale General Plan (1993)	
Goal N1: Minimize the exposure of residents to excessive noise to the extent possible, through the land planning and the development review process.	Consistent. As described in Section 3.4, Noise and Vibration, the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would incorporate IAMFs addressing construction-period noise impacts and would include mitigation measures addressing operational noise.
Objective N1.2: Protect and maintain those areas having acceptable noise environments.	
Policy N1.2.4: Where deemed appropriate based upon available information, acoustical analysis and appropriate mitigation for noise-sensitive land uses should be required in areas which may be adversely impacted by significant intermittent noise sources. Such noise sources may include but not be limited to railroads, racetracks, stadiums, aircraft overflights and similar uses.	
Objective L2.3: Revitalize the core area of Palmdale to maintain and enhance its economic viability.	Consistent. The project would encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which would promote revitalization of the core area of Palmdale.
Policy L1.1.2: Provide incentives to promote infill development in order to foster more cohesive neighborhoods, maximize use of infrastructure, consolidate development patterns, and enhance community appearance.	Consistent. The project would improve mobility and accessibility. Such development would provide an opportunity for transit-oriented development planning and infill development near station areas.
Policy L2.3.1(5): Promote establishment of a transportation facility within the downtown area, serving as a hub for rail, bus, and other public transportation systems.	Consistent. The project includes high-speed rail and associated multimodal linkages. The Palmdale Station would be a multimodal hub that would promote other types of public transit in addition to high-speed rail.
Policy CD 2.3.2: Identify and preserve unique cultural and historic buildings and features in order to enhance community character.	Consistent. The project would comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding the identification and preservation or protection of cultural and historic buildings and features, including mitigation requirements.
Policy ER 5.1.2: Reduce vehicle nonwork trips through merchant transportation incentives, distance learning, and transit system improvements.	Consistent. The project would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which would reduce total vehicle miles traveled.
Policy C2.2.3: Encourage location of bikeways and storage areas that are integrated with public transit facilities.	Consistent. The Palmdale Station would include bicycle storage facilities.
Policy C2.2.4: Encourage development of regional rail transit serving the Palmdale area.	Consistent. The project would include a dedicated station in Palmdale connected to a Build Alternative.
Policy C2.2.6: Establish a regional transportation center within the city, conveniently located to maximize access to downtown and major commercial centers, which will accommodate a variety of public transportation uses including rail, bus, and shuttle service.	Consistent. The project would include a station in Palmdale as part of a Build Alternative that would provide connections to other surface transit services in the area.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Policy PS1.3.3: Encourage development that fully utilizes existing infrastructure systems while decreasing the need for costly extensions of infrastructure into undeveloped areas.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project would encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which is served by existing public service infrastructure and services, consistent with the general plan and zoning ordinances. Therefore, the Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.</p>
<p>City of Palmdale General Plan – Housing Element Update (2021)</p>	
<p>Goal H2: Preserve and Improve the Existing Supply of Affordable Housing</p>	<p>Consistent. The project would displace existing housing in Palmdale. However, sufficient replacement housing sites are available in the surrounding area to accommodate the relocation of the residents displaced by the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section.</p>
<p>Palmdale Transit Village Specific Plan (2007)</p>	
<p>Goal L2: Adopt land-use and development policies that encourage growth and diversification of the city's economic base.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project proposes high-speed rail, which would improve mobility and accessibility and provide an opportunity for transit-oriented development planning and infill development near station areas.</p>
<p>Goal L3: Provide a high quality of life for all existing and future residents, meeting the needs of a variety of lifestyles.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project would be part of a high-speed rail system that would improve mobility and accessibility and provide an opportunity for transit-oriented development planning and infill development near station areas, creating employment opportunities that could diversify the city's economic base.</p>
<p>Goal L6: Plan for and reserve land to accommodate uses needed for public benefit, including open space, recreation, public improvement, school and community facilities.</p>	<p>Inconsistent for all six Build Alternatives. Although the Palmdale Transit Village Specific Plan supports and acknowledges future HSR development, the project alignment, station, and other ancillary features require the conversion to transportation uses of existing residential land along Clock Tower Plaza Drive, Avenue P, and Avenue Q. Additionally, school facilities at Avenue Q and Clock Tower Plaza within the Palmdale Transit Village Specific Plan area would be converted to transportation uses. These areas would not be consistent with adjacent land uses or consistent with local policies.</p>
<p>Los Angeles County General Plan (2015)</p>	
<p>Goal LU 4: Infill development and redevelopment that strengthen and enhance communities.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project proposes a high-speed rail system that would improve mobility and accessibility. Such development would provide an opportunity for transit-oriented development planning and infill development near station areas in Palmdale and Burbank.</p>
<p>Policy LU 4.1: Encourage infill development in urban and suburban areas on vacant, underutilized, and/or brownfield sites.</p>	
<p>Policy LU 4.3: Encourage transit-oriented development in urban and suburban areas with the appropriate residential density along transit corridors and within station areas.</p>	

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Policy LU 6.1: Protect rural communities from the encroachment of incompatible development that conflicts with existing land-use patterns and service standards.</p>	<p>Consistent. Most of the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternative alignments within rural areas would be within tunnels. Within rural areas, aboveground portions of the project such as access roads would generally follow existing corridors. The presence of the Build Alternatives would be unlikely to induce substantial growth or intensify land uses within rural areas where there is no interface or access point to the HSR system. Therefore, the project would not encourage inconsistent land development in rural communities. See Section 3.18, Regional Growth, for further detail.</p>
<p>Goal M4: An efficient multimodal transportation system that serves the needs of all residents.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project would provide one component of a multimodal circulation system including local roadways, freeways, bicycle lanes, and bus and rail, to address transportation needs of the project area.</p>
<p>Policy M 4.9: Ensure the participation of all potentially affected communities in the transportation planning and decision-making process.</p>	<p>Consistent. The planning and environmental processes for the project have provided, and would continue to provide, extensive opportunities for members and representatives of affected communities to participate in the planning, evaluation, and decision-making processes for this project. Please refer to Chapter 9, Public and Agency Involvement, for additional information on outreach efforts.</p>
<p>Policy M 4.10: Support the linkage of regional and community-level transportation systems, including multimodal networks.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project would substantially expand the regional transit system and continue to coordinate multimodal linkages with existing public transit service infrastructure and services for increased accessibility.</p>
<p>Policy C/NR14.3: Support the preservation and rehabilitation of historic buildings.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project would comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding the preservation and rehabilitation of historic resources, including mitigation requirements.</p>
<p>Policy N1.7: Utilize traffic management and noise suppression techniques to minimize noise from traffic and transportation systems.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project includes measures to reduce construction- and operation-period noise effects including a noise monitoring program, potential for noise barriers, etc. (see Section 3.4, Noise and Vibration)</p>
<p>Policy N1.8: Minimize noise impacts on pedestrians and transit riders in the design of transportation facilities and mobility networks.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project would include measures to reduce construction- and operation-period noise effects including a noise monitoring program, potential for noise barriers, etc. (see Section 3.4, Noise and Vibration).</p>
<p>Goal ED1: An economic base and fiscal structures that attract and retain valuable industries and businesses.</p>	<p>Consistent. Although the project would result in short-term impacts, in the long term it would result in beneficial impacts by stimulating economic growth for the region over time.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Goal ED2: Land-use practices and regulations that foster economic development and growth.	Consistent. The project would result in long-term economic growth for the region and may encourage infill development near HSR station sites and would indirectly support a mix of land uses, including commercial development. The project may attract new businesses to the station areas by improving regional transportation access.
Policy ED2.7: Incentivize economic development and growth along existing transportation corridors and in urbanized areas.	Consistent. The project would encourage new infill development near the HSR station sites, which are co-located with existing transportation corridors and facilities (e.g., Metrolink, Palmdale Transportation Center, Hollywood Burbank Airport, and local roadways). The project may attract new businesses to the station areas by improving regional transportation access in the Palmdale area.
Goal ED3: An expanded and improved infrastructure system to support economic growth and development.	Consistent. The project would support and promote redevelopment of the areas immediately surrounding the HSR station sites, which are served by existing public service infrastructure and services, making these sites more attractive for future development by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California.
Policy ED3.3: Work with state agencies dedicated to financing important critical infrastructure and economic development projects.	Consistent. The Authority is working with federal and state agencies at all levels to plan the California HSR system, including funding for the design and construction of the project.
Los Angeles County Antelope Valley Area Plan 2035 (2015)	
Policy M 2.4: Develop multimodal transportation systems that offer alternatives to automobile travel by implementing the policies regarding regional transportation, local transit, bicycle routes, trails, and pedestrian access contained in the Mobility Element.	Consistent. The project would include multimodal transportation access at all HSR station sites, connecting the county to the larger statewide HSR system.
Policy M 6.7: Establish a regional transportation hub in Palmdale with feeder transit service to the rural areas of the unincorporated Antelope Valley.	Consistent. The project includes high-speed rail and associated multimodal linkages. The Authority continues to coordinate with other transit agencies to connect Antelope Valley to the HSR system through these multimodal linkages.
Policy M 6.7: Establish a regional transportation hub in Palmdale with feeder transit service to the rural areas of the unincorporated Antelope Valley.	Consistent. The project includes high-speed rail and associated multimodal linkages, and the Authority continues to coordinate with other transit agencies.
Policy M 6.8: In planning for all regional transportation systems, consider and mitigate potential impacts on existing communities, and minimize land-use conflicts.	Consistent. Potential environmental impacts of the project that are under the purview of NEPA and CEQA are analyzed within this Draft EIR/EIS document. Mitigation measures are proposed for significant impacts. Additionally, the project has incorporated IAMFs into its design.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Policy M 6.9: Engage regional agencies, such as Caltrans, Southern California Association of Governments, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), and the California High Speed Rail Authority, in the implementation of an effective, efficient, integrated multimodal regional transportation network. Ensure adequate funding on an ongoing basis through financing programs, such as grants, congestion pricing, bonding, fair-share cost assignments, etc.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Authority has coordinated closely with other state, regional and local agencies in locating HSR station sites so that they promote effective, efficient multimodal connections to regional and local transportation networks.</p>
Los Angeles County Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan (2012)	
<p>Policy C-1.1.10: Provide for flexibility in the transportation system to accommodate new technology as it becomes available, in order to reduce trips by vehicles using fossil fuels where feasible and appropriate.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. The project would provide a new regional HSR transportation option that would be expected to reduce dependence on automobiles for trips to/from other urban centers in California.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. No portion of the E1, E1A, E2, or E2A Build Alternative alignments would cross this plan area.</p>
<p>Policy C-1.2.11: Reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) through the use of smart growth concepts.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. The project would provide efficient movement of people, which would reduce total vehicle miles traveled, thus reducing air pollutants.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. No portion of the E1, E1A, E2, or E2A Build Alternative alignments would cross this plan area.</p>
<p>Policy C-4.1.7: Facilitate coordination of planning for any future high-speed regional rail systems in the valley with Metrolink services.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. The project includes high-speed rail and associated multimodal linkages, and the Authority continues to coordinate with other transit agencies.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. No portion of the E1, E1A, E2, or E2A Build Alternative alignments would cross this plan area.</p>
<p>Policy C-4.2.2: Coordinate with other agencies as needed to facilitate planning for other high-speed rail alternatives in the Santa Clarita Valley.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. The project includes high-speed rail and associated multimodal linkages, and the Authority continues to coordinate with other transit agencies.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. No portion of the E1, E1A, E2, or E2A Build Alternative alignments would cross this plan area.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
City of Los Angeles Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles (2015)	
<p>Policy 1.7 – Displacement and Health: Reduce the harmful health impacts of displacement on individuals, families, and communities by pursuing strategies to create opportunities for existing residents to benefit from local revitalization efforts by: creating local employment and economic opportunities for low-income residents and local small businesses; expanding and preserving existing housing opportunities available to low-income residents; preserving cultural and social resources; and creating and implementing tools to evaluate and mitigate the potential displacement caused by large-scale investment and development</p>	<p>Inconsistent for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. In the long term, the areas around the Palmdale and Burbank Stations would likely be revitalized, bringing economic benefits to their communities. In the short term, the project would result in a substantial number of residential and nonresidential displacements, (including displacement of environmental justice populations). In Sun Valley, insufficient availability of replacement units to accommodate all displaced residents was identified.</p> <p>Inconsistent for the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives. In addition to Sun Valley, Lake View Terrace would also have insufficient replacement units available to accommodate all displaced residents for the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives.</p>
<p>Policy 5.1 – Air pollution and respiratory health: Reduce air pollution from stationary and mobile sources; protect human health and welfare and promote improved respiratory health.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project would provide efficient movement of people, which would reduce total VMT, thus reducing air pollutants.</p>
<p>Objective 2 (Nonairport): Reduce or eliminate nonairport-related intrusive noise, especially relative to noise-sensitive uses.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project would incorporate IAMFs that would reduce or eliminate construction-period noise impacts and include mitigation measures addressing operational noise.</p>
<p>Policy 2.2: Enforce and/or implement applicable city, state, and federal regulations intended to mitigate proposed noise-producing activities, reduce intrusive noise and alleviate noise that is deemed a public nuisance. (P5 through P10)</p>	<p>Consistent. The project would incorporate IAMFs addressing construction-period noise impacts and include mitigation measures addressing operational noise.</p>
Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace-Shadow Hills-East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan (1997)	
<p>Policy 1-1.4: The city should promote neighborhood preservation in existing residential neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Not Applicable for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, or E1A Build Alternatives. No portion of the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, or E1A Build Alternative alignments would cross this plan area.</p> <p>Inconsistent for the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives. Wherever possible, project features would utilize existing roads and previously developed areas, thereby minimizing the inconsistent land uses. However, the E2 Alternative would displace existing residential land within neighborhoods (Lake View Terrace and Shadow Hills) and convert residential uses to transportation use to accommodate rail alignment, utility easement, and access. Therefore, the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives would be inconsistent with this goal.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Policy 1-3.3: Preserve existing views of hillside and mountainous areas.</p>	<p>Not Applicable for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, or E1A Build Alternatives. No portion of the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, or E1A Build Alternative alignments would cross this plan area.</p> <p>Consistent for the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives. Given that the HSR alignment would be underground in the northern portion of Lake View Terrace where residents currently enjoy views of the hillside and mountainous areas, existing views would be preserved.</p>
<p>Policy 10-1.4: Coordinate with Metro and the Los Angeles Department of Transportation to develop an intermodal public transportation plan to implement linkages to rail service.</p>	<p>Not Applicable for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, or E1A Build Alternatives. No portion of the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, or E1A Build Alternative alignments would cross this plan area.</p> <p>Consistent for the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives. The project includes one portion of a high-speed rail system and associated multimodal linkages, and the Authority would continue to coordinate with Metro and other transit agencies.</p>
Sylmar Community Plan (1997)	
<p>Policy 1-1.2: Protect existing single-family residential neighborhoods from encroachment by higher-density residential and other incompatible uses.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. Single-family residential neighborhoods would not be impacted by the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, or E1A Build Alternatives, which would follow the same alignment near the community of Sylmar. Several temporary construction staging areas would be located northeast of Sylmar. Additionally, a utility easement would travel within the existing roadway within a single-family neighborhood. Development within the Sylmar Community Plan area would not require conversion of existing residential areas.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E2 or E2A Build Alternatives. No portion of the E2 or E2A Build Alternative alignments would cross this plan area</p>
<p>Policy 1-1.7: Maintain the community plan's land uses designated for residential as single-family residential uses.</p>	
<p>Policy 1-1.8: The city should promote neighborhood preservation, particularly in existing single-family neighborhoods, as well as in areas with existing multiple-family residences.</p>	
<p>Policy 11-2.1: Develop an intermodal mass transportation plan to implement linkages to future rail service.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. The project includes high-speed rail and associated multimodal linkages.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E2 or E2A Build Alternatives. No portion of the E2 or E2A Build Alternative alignments would cross this plan area</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan (2004)	
<p>Prominent Ridgeline Section 6: A mountain ridge as shown on Map No. 2, that has significant aesthetic quality as a scenic resource, defines a region, or is unique and visually prominent as determined by the Director of Planning or the Advisory Agency. Prominent Ridgelines are identified by a line connecting the series of elevation points running through the center of the long axis of the ridge, including endpoint elevations, which are provided to indicate the approximate terminus of the Prominent Ridgeline. No Project may be constructed within any Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area or portion of the area except as permitted pursuant to Section 6B. (Section 6B: Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsection A above, a Project may encroach into the Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area where it can be demonstrated that: All or most of the Prominent Ridgeline remains undisturbed; and the Project incorporates design elements that consider the natural terrain, utilizes a minimum of grading, and protects streams and oak trees (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>, <i>Q. lobata</i>) to the extent feasible; and the project is placed or constructed to preclude silhouettes against the skyline above the prominent Ridgeline of the site.</p>	<p>Not Applicable for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, or E1A Build Alternatives. No portion of the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, or E1A Build Alternative alignments would cross this plan area.</p> <p>Consistent for the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives. The proposed rail alignment would not alter or disrupt ridgeline views from any viewpoints. Refer to Section 3.16, Aesthetics and Visual Quality, for further detail.</p>
<p>Scenic Highway Corridors Viewshed Protection Section 9. Section 9 identifies restrictions to development within a scenic corridor. Any new project must include landscaping to minimize the visual impacts of the project as seen from the right-of-way of any of the scenic highways.</p>	<p>Not Applicable for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, or E1A Build Alternatives. No portion of the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, or E1A Build Alternative alignments would cross this plan area.</p> <p>Consistent for the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives. The E2 and E2A Build Alternative RSA is within the plan area, but the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives would not directly traverse any of the scenic corridors identified within the San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan Area. Therefore, visual impacts of the project as seen from the scenic highways would be minimal.</p>
Arleta-Pacoima Community Plan (1996)	
<p>Protect single-family character of neighborhoods. Preserve and enhance the positive characteristics of the existing residential neighborhoods while providing a variety of housing opportunities with compatible new housing.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. New tracks and construction staging areas would be located within this plan area. The aboveground project features within the plan area would be mostly within industrial areas near I-210 and near San Fernando Road. Therefore, development within the plan area would not require conversion of existing residential areas into incompatible land-use designations.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E2 or E2A Build Alternatives. No portion of the E2 or E2A Build Alternative alignments would cross this plan area.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Maximize development opportunities provided by the future rail transit system while minimizing any adverse impacts.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. The project includes high-speed rail and associated multimodal linkages.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E2 or E2A Build Alternatives. No portion of the E2 or E2A Build Alternative alignments would cross this plan area.</p>
Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon Community Plan (1999)	
<p>Policy 1-1.2 Protect existing single-family residential neighborhoods from encroachment by higher-density residential and other incompatible uses.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. For the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives, new tracks and construction staging areas would be located within this plan area. There would be no new at-grade tracks within residential neighborhoods in the plan area. The project within the plan area would be mostly within industrial areas near San Fernando Road. Additionally, the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would utilize the existing rail corridor; thus, development within the plan area would not require conversion of existing residential areas into incompatible land uses.</p> <p>Consistent for the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives. The E2 and E2A Build Alternatives would be constructed/contained within a tunnel within this plan area. The tunnel would be constructed using the cut-and-cover method in some industrial and commercial areas. Development within the Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon Community Plan Area would not encroach upon low-density residential areas, nor would it require conversion of existing residential areas into incompatible land uses, since the alignment would be in tunnel below residential areas and so would not displace or otherwise disrupt these neighborhoods.</p>
City of Burbank 2035 General Plan (2013)	
<p>Policy LU 1.3: Maintain and protect Burbank's residential neighborhoods by avoiding encroachment of incompatible land uses and public facilities.</p>	<p>Consistent. Project-related improvements within the Burbank Subsection would be limited to areas near existing industrial areas or rights-of-way.</p>
<p>Policy 3.5: Ensure that architecture and site design are high quality, creative, complementary to Burbank's character, and compatible with surrounding development and public spaces</p>	<p>Consistent. The architecture and site design of the Burbank Airport Station would be of high quality, built with durable construction materials and subject to regular maintenance. The architectural style of the station would be largely inspired by Burbank's character and local context. The site design considers the opportunities and constraints that the site faces and is compatible with surrounding development and public spaces.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Policy 4.1: Develop complete streets that create functional places meeting the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, wheelchair users, equestrians, and motorists.</p>	<p>Consistent. The design of the Burbank Airport Station prioritizes circulation and multimodal connectivity. To create a successful transportation hub for the City of Burbank, the site design considers the importance of major thoroughfares such as San Fernando Road and Hollywood Way. Developing complete streets along these roads would facilitate people getting to and from the station while also allowing for a safe connection for all commuters, regardless of mode. The site design provides complete streets with public spaces along the station perimeter to provide accessibility for all modes of travel.</p>
<p>Policy 4.2: Identify opportunities for publicly accessible open spaces to be provided in conjunction with both public and private development projects.</p>	<p>Consistent. The largest publicly accessible open spaces would be entry plazas provided around station entrances. These entry plazas would be connected by linear plazas and open spaces that would work in conjunction with any future public or private development projects adjacent to the station site.</p>
<p>Policy 4.3: Use street trees, landscaping, street furniture, public art, and other aesthetic elements to enhance the appearance and identity of neighborhoods and public spaces.</p>	<p>Consistent. The various open spaces included in the site design (i.e., entry plazas, linear plazas, and transit plazas) would accommodate a mixture of public art, street furniture, landscaping, and other street elements that would enhance the overall neighborhood identity. Similarly, street trees, landscaping, and other site design techniques would shield certain uses from public view (e.g., surface parking, station maintenance facilities).</p>
<p>Policy 4.4: Require public art as part of new development projects and public infrastructure. Incorporate public art within existing projects.</p>	<p>Consistent. The site design incorporates several public spaces that could ultimately be used as places to display public art.</p>
<p>Policy 4.5: Require that pedestrian-oriented areas include amenities such as sidewalks of adequate width, benches, street trees and landscaping, decorative paving, public art, kiosks, and restrooms.</p>	<p>Consistent. Generally, all pedestrian-oriented areas would be configured and designed to include wide sidewalks, street furniture; street trees; landscaping; decorative materials; and direct access to kiosks, restrooms, and station entrances. These amenities would be provided to create a safe, shaded, enjoyable walking experience for station users.</p>
<p>Policy 4.8: Locate parking lots and structures behind buildings or underground. Do not design parking lots and structures to face streets or sidewalks at ground level. Use alternatives to surface parking lots to reduce the amount of land devoted to parking.</p>	<p>Consistent. Site design strategies would ensure that a reduced amount of land is devoted to parking and that parking uses are screened from public view. Locating parking lots behind buildings as much as possible and using street trees would reduce the visibility of parking from adjacent public streets.</p>
<p>Policy 4.9: Improve parking lot aesthetics and reduce the urban heat island effect by providing ample shade, low-water landscaping, and trees.</p>	<p>Consistent. Parking lot design would use small block sizes and a generous amount of landscaping to improve aesthetics and reduce the urban heat island effect. Parking lots would be connected by a series of walkways that would incorporate ample shade, low-water landscaping, and diverse paving materials.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Policy 4.11: Ensure that public infrastructure meets high-quality urban design and architecture standards. Remove, relocate, or improve the appearance of existing infrastructure elements that are unsightly or visually disruptive.	Consistent. The station area would use site design techniques to modify and improve the appearance of existing infrastructure and ultimately help to limit unsightly and visually disruptive elements. New infrastructure such as station bridges and internal roadways would use high-quality design techniques and materials to aesthetically enhance the station.
Policy 2.1: Improve Burbank's alternative transportation access to local and regional destinations through land-use decisions that support multimodal transportation.	Consistent. The project would provide one component of a multimodal circulation system to enhance regional transportation.
Policy 4.5: Improve transit connections with nearby communities and connections to Downtown Los Angeles, West San Fernando Valley, Hollywood, and the Westside.	Consistent. The station area site design includes a multimodal transit center that would seamlessly connect local and regional transit systems.
Policy 4.8: Promote multimodal transit centers and stops to encourage seamless connections between local and regional transit systems, pedestrian and bicycle networks, and commercial and employment centers.	Consistent. The station area site design includes a multimodal transit center that would seamlessly connect local and regional transit systems. The station area would offer a variety of public spaces that would help to enhance the streetscape along critical pedestrian and bicycle networks while also encouraging active transportation and strengthening the connection to commercial and employment centers.
Goal 4 – Train Noise: Burbank's train service network reduces noise levels affecting residential areas and noise-sensitive land uses.	Consistent. The project includes IAMFs that reduce construction-period noise impacts. The project also includes mitigation measures that would reduce operations noise.
City of Lancaster General Plan 2030 (2009)	
Objective 3.3: Preserve acceptable air quality by striving to attain and maintain national, state, and local air quality standards.	Consistent. The project would provide an alternative to automobile transportation for travel to/from urban centers in California, which would reduce total VMT.
Policy 3.3.1: Minimize the number of vehicular miles traveled	Consistent. The project would provide an alternative to automobile transportation for travel to/from urban centers in California, which would reduce total VMT.
Policy 3.5.3: Protect lands currently in agricultural production from the negative impacts created when urban and rural land uses exist in close proximity while recognizing the possibility of their long-term conversion to urban and rural use.	Consistent. None of the six Build Alternatives would traverse any designated Important Farmland in Lancaster. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 4.3.2: Wherever feasible, manage the generation of single event noise levels from motor vehicles, trains, aircraft, commercial, industrial, construction, and other activities such that single event noise levels are no greater than 15 a-weighted decibels (dBA) above the noise objectives included in the plan for Public Health and Safety.	Consistent. Both IAMFs and mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce project noise to acceptable levels.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Policy 4.4.2: Limit the uses surrounding airport facilities at Fox Field, Edwards Air Force Base, and Plant 42 to ensure their continued safe operation.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Authority would coordinate the design, construction, and operation of the project with the Airport Master Plan for Plant 42 to ensure that the project would not conflict with operations at that airport.</p>
<p>Policy 14.4.2: Promote the use of alternative modes of transportation through the development of convenient and attractive facilities that support and accommodate the services.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project would provide a new high-speed regional rail travel option to and from urban centers in California with a station in the city of Palmdale that would serve travelers from the city of Lancaster. In addition, the HSR station in Palmdale would include multimodal transportation options for first and last mile travel. Therefore, the project would promote a range of alternative modes of transportation.</p>
<p>Lancaster General Plan Housing Element (2014 – 2021)</p>	
<p>Goal 6: To promote sufficient housing to meet the diverse housing needs of all economic segments of the present and future city of Lancaster.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project would result in 12 residential displacements in Lancaster; however, sufficient replacement housing sites are available in the surrounding area to accommodate the relocation of the residents displaced by the project.</p>
<p>Goal 7: To preserve existing housing stock within areas for which a desirable living environment can be provided; to promote conversion of such residential areas for which a desirable living environment cannot be sustained.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project would require demolition of existing housing in Lancaster. Although sufficient replacement housing sites are available in the surrounding area to accommodate the relocation of the residents displaced by the project, the project would result in the loss of housing stock in the city.</p>
<p>Section 3.13 Station Planning, Land Use, and Development</p>	
<p>Southern California Association of Governments Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016)</p>	
<p>Goal 2: Maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section proposes an HSR system that would improve mobility and accessibility within Southern California and beyond.</p>
<p>Goal 8: Encourage land use and growth patterns that facilitate transit and non-motorized transportation.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section proposes an HSR system that would improve mobility and accessibility. Construction of the stations in Palmdale and Burbank near existing transportation services would provide an opportunity for these cities to meet their transit-oriented development (TOD) planning and infill development goals near station areas.</p>
<p>Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 (2015)</p>	
<p>Policy LU 3.3: Discourage development in undeveloped areas where infrastructure and public services do not exist, or where no major infrastructure projects are planned, such as state and/or federal highways.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would place stations in already urbanized areas of Palmdale and Burbank rather than in undeveloped areas. Existing infrastructure would be used to the maximum extent feasible.</p>
<p>Policy LU 4.1: Encourage infill development in urban and suburban areas on vacant, underutilized, and/or brownfield sites.</p>	<p>Consistent. The construction of HSR stations in Palmdale and Burbank would provide opportunities to achieve infill development and TOD land use goals in urban areas.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Policy LU 4.3: Encourage transit-oriented development (TOD) in urban and suburban areas with the appropriate residential density along transit corridors and within station areas.	Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section proposes an HSR system that would provide opportunities to achieve TOD planning and infill development goals near station areas.
Policy LU 6.1: Protect rural communities from the encroachment of incompatible development that conflicts with existing land use patterns and service standards.	Consistent. Substantial portions of the proposed new rail alignment in rural areas would be within tunnels. Proposed new aboveground uses, such as access roads within rural areas, would generally follow existing road or rail corridors, except for certain locations further described in the impact analysis. The presence of the HSR alignment would be unlikely to induce substantial growth or intensify land uses within rural areas where there is no interface or access point to the HSR system. Growth related to the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would instead be expected to occur near stations and the Maintenance Facility where such interfaces/access points would be created. Therefore, all six Build Alternatives would not encourage incompatible land development in rural communities. See Section 3.18, Regional Growth, for further detail.
Policy LU 6.2: Encourage land uses and developments that are compatible with the natural environment and landscape.	
Policy LU 7.1: Reduce and mitigate the impacts of incompatible land uses, where feasible, using buffers and other design techniques.	
Policy LU 7.3: Protect public and semi-public facilities, including but not limited to major landfills, natural gas storage facilities, and solid waste disposal sites from incompatible uses.	Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would displace several public facilities. However, such facilities would be relocated in accordance with federal and state policies. See Section 3.12, Socioeconomics and Communities, for further detail.
Policy M 4.1: Expand transportation options that reduce automobile dependence.	Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section proposes an HSR system that would provide a viable alternative to highway travel and would improve mobility and accessibility. See Section 3.2, Transportation, for further detail.
Policy M 5.1: Facilitate transit-oriented land uses and pedestrian-oriented design, particularly in the first-last mile connections to transit, to encourage transit ridership.	Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section proposes an HSR system that would improve mobility and accessibility. Such development would provide opportunities to meet TOD planning and infill development goals near station areas. In addition, stations would be designed as pedestrian-friendly environments that encourage first/last mile connectivity. See Section 3.2, Transportation, for further detail.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan (2004)	
<p>G-4 Prohibit any uses which will negatively affect safe air navigation.</p>	<p>Consistent. Aboveground portions of the rail alignment would be located within the Airport Influence Areas of the Palmdale and Hollywood Burbank Airports. In the Palmdale area, the rail alignment would be located alongside existing Metrolink tracks. Through the influence area for the Hollywood Burbank Airport, the rail alignment would be underground in a retained cut in the space of the current Metrolink Antelope Valley line. The proposed alignment and the Burbank Airport Station would be located underground and north of the existing east/west runway and thus would not result in negative effect on safe air navigation.</p>
<p>S-4 Prohibit, within a designated runway protection zone (RPZ), the erection or growth of objects which rise above an approach surface unless supported by evidence that it does not create a safety hazard and is approved by the Federal Aviation Administration.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. The Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A alignment would be in a retained cut/trench through a portion of the Hollywood Burbank Airport's RPZ, which crosses San Fernando Road and the existing Antelope Valley Metrolink alignment. Underground tunneling would not pose a safety hazard within RPZs. The Burbank Airport Station would be located primarily underground and located north of the existing east/west runway. Therefore, no safety hazard is expected to be created.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives. The E2 and E2A alignment would not traverse an RPZ.</p>
<p>S-7: Comply with the height restriction standards and procedures set forth in FAR Part 77.</p>	<p>Consistent. FAR Part 77 defines imaginary surfaces that are used to identify obstructions to air navigation. Part 77 sets forth structural height limits of 200 feet above ground level, or above the established airport elevation, whichever is higher, within 1.2 miles of the airport. As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, Palmdale to Burbank Project Section facilities comply with the height restrictions set forth in FAR Part 77.</p>
Los Angeles County Antelope Valley Area Plan (2015)	
<p>Policy LU 1.2: Limit the amount of potential development in rural preserve areas, through appropriate land use designations with very low residential densities, as indicated in the Land Use Policy Map (Map 2.1) of this Area Plan.</p>	<p>Consistent. Although all six Build Alternatives would pass through several rural preserve areas, it would represent a new transportation corridor and not spur new development in rural areas away from station areas. Most of the alignment would be within a tunnel within the central subsection. Furthermore, the construction of a station in Palmdale would provide opportunities to meet TOD and infill development goals in an existing urban area.</p>
<p>Policy LU 2.6: Except within economic opportunity areas, limit the amount of potential developments near the National Forests and on private lands within the National Forests, through appropriate land use designations with very low residential densities, as indicated in the Land Use Policy Map (Map 2.1) of this Area Plan.</p>	<p>Consistent. While all six Build Alternatives would pass through several rural preserve areas, most of the alignment would be within a tunnel within the Central Subsection and within the ANF, with the exception of ancillary structures such as adits. Furthermore, the construction of a station in Palmdale would provide opportunities to meet TOD and infill development goals in an existing urban area.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Policy M 6.5: Support the development of the California HSR System, with a station in Palmdale to provide links to Northern California and other portions of Southern California, and encourage the participation of private enterprise and capital.	Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section proposes an HSR system and associated multimodal linkages, including a station in Palmdale.
Policy M 6.9: Engage regional agencies, such as the California Department of Transportation, SCAG, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), and the Authority in the implementation of an effective and efficient integrated multimodal regional transportation network. Ensure adequate funding on an ongoing basis through financing programs, such as grants, congestion pricing, bonding, fair share cost assignments, etc.	Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section proposes an HSR system and associated multimodal linkages and continues to coordinate with other transit agencies.
City of Lancaster General Plan 2030 (2009)	
Policy 14.4.1(b): Work with the Authority and other agencies to support the development of an HSR system through the Antelope Valley	Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section proposes an HSR system and associated multimodal linkages and continues to coordinate with other transit agencies.
Goal 7: To preserve existing housing stock within areas for which a desirable living environment can be provided; to promote conversion of such residential areas for which a desirable living environment cannot be sustained.	Inconsistent for all six Build Alternatives. The HSR system would require the demolition of existing housing in Lancaster. While sufficient replacement housing sites are available in the surrounding area to accommodate the relocation of the residents displaced by the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, the HSR system would result in the loss of housing stock within Lancaster. See Section 3.12, Socioeconomics and Communities, for further detail.
City of Palmdale General Plan (1993)	
Policy L1.1.2: Provide incentives to promote infill development, in order to foster more cohesive neighborhoods, maximize use of infrastructure, consolidate development patterns, and enhance community appearance.	Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section proposes an HSR system that would improve mobility and accessibility. Such development would provide opportunities to meet TOD planning and infill development goals in Palmdale.
Policy L2.3.1(5): Promote establishment of a transportation facility within the downtown area, serving as a hub for rail, bus, and other public transportation systems.	Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section proposes an HSR system and associated multimodal linkages. The Palmdale station would be a multimodal hub that would promote other types of public transit in addition to HSR.
Palmdale Trade and Commerce Center Specific Plan (2017)	
Encourage the development of regional transit facilities within the Specific Plan area.	Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section proposes an HSR system that would improve mobility and accessibility, including a station in Palmdale. Such development would provide opportunities to meet TOD planning and infill development goals.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Palmdale Transit Village Specific Plan (2007)	
<p>Goal L2: Adopt land use and development policies which encourage growth and diversification of the city's economic base.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section proposes an HSR system that would improve mobility and accessibility. Such development would provide opportunities to meet TOD planning and infill development goals, thereby creating employment opportunities that would encourage diversification of the city's economic base.</p>
<p>Goal L3: Provide a high quality of life for all existing and future residents, meeting the needs of a variety of lifestyles.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section proposes an HSR system that would improve mobility and accessibility. Such development would provide opportunities to meet TOD planning and infill development goals, thereby providing new opportunities for a variety of lifestyles including reduced reliance on single occupant vehicles.</p>
<p>Goal L6: Plan for and reserve land to accommodate uses needed for public benefit, including open space, recreation, public improvement, school, and community facilities.</p>	<p>Inconsistent for all six Build Alternatives. Although the plan acknowledges and supports the HSR system proposed in the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, the Build Alternative alignments, stations, and other ancillary features would require the conversion of existing residential land along Clock Tower Plaza Drive, Avenue P, and Avenue Q to transportation uses. Additionally, school facilities at Avenue Q and Clock Tower Plaza within the Palmdale Transit Village Specific Plan area would be converted to transportation uses. These areas would not be compatible with adjacent land uses or local policies.</p>
Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace-Shadow Hills-East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan (1997) (Part of City of Los Angeles General Plan)	
<p>Policy 1-3.3 Preserve existing views of hillside and mountainous areas.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A alignments would be underground in this area; existing views of hillside and mountainous areas from public vantage points would be preserved. The E2 and E2A alignments in this area includes an aboveground viaduct that would cross the Tujunga Wash. However, this viaduct would not obstruct existing views of hillsides and mountainous areas to the east. See Section 3.16, Aesthetics and Visual Quality, for further detail.</p>
<p>Policy 10-1.4 Coordinate with the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority and Los Angeles Department of Transportation to develop an intermodal public transportation plan to implement linkages to rail service.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section proposes an HSR system and associated multimodal linkages and would continue to coordinate with other transit agencies.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Policy 1-1.4 The City should promote neighborhood preservation in existing residential neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. Palmdale to Burbank Project Section features would preserve neighborhoods by utilizing existing roads and previously developed areas wherever possible. Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A would not divide neighborhoods because the alignment would not be at grade through residential areas.</p> <p>Inconsistent for the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives. Wherever possible, E2 and E2A Build Alternative features would use existing roads and previously developed areas, thereby minimizing the encroachment of incompatible land uses. However, the project would displace existing residential development within neighborhoods (Lake View Terrace and Shadow Hills) to accommodate construction staging, rail alignment, utility easement, access road, and drainage.</p>
Sylmar Community Plan (1997) (Part of City of Los Angeles General Plan)	
<p>Policy 1-1.2 Protect existing single-family residential neighborhoods from encroachment by higher density residential and other incompatible uses.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. Several temporary construction staging areas would be located northeast of Sylmar. Additionally, a utility easement would run through the existing roadway within a single-family residential neighborhood. Implementation of the SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives within the Sylmar Community Plan area would not require conversion of existing residential land uses into incompatible land uses.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E2 and E2A Build Alternative. No portion of the E2 and E2A alignment would cross this plan area.</p>
<p>Policy 1-1.7 Maintain the Plan land uses designated for residential as single-family residential uses.</p>	
<p>Policy 1-1.8 The City should promote neighborhood preservation, particularly in existing single-family neighborhoods, as well as in areas with existing multiple-family residences.</p>	

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan (2003)	
<p>Prominent Ridgeline Section 6. A mountain ridge as shown on Map No. 2, that has significant aesthetic quality as a scenic resource, defines a region or is unique and visually prominent as determined by the Director of Planning or the Advisory Agency. Prominent Ridgelines are identified by a line connecting the series of elevation points running through the center of the long axis of the ridge, including endpoint elevations, which are provided to indicate the approximate terminus of the Prominent Ridgeline. No project may be constructed within any Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area or portion of the area except as permitted pursuant to Section 6B. (Section 6B: Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsection A above, a project may encroach into the Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area where it can be demonstrated that: All or most of the Prominent Ridgeline remains undisturbed; and the project incorporates design elements that consider the natural terrain, utilizes a minimum of grading, and protects streams and oak trees (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>, <i>Q. lobata</i>) to the extent feasible; and the project is placed or constructed to preclude silhouettes against the skyline above the Prominent Ridgeline of the site.</p>	<p>Not Applicable for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. No portion of the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A alignments would cross this plan area.</p> <p>Consistent for the E2 and E2A Build Alternative. The plan identifies prominent ridgelines and prohibits grading, vegetation removal, and improvements within prominent ridgeline areas. Views of the prominent ridgelines would be available from the alignment, but the proposed alignment would not alter or disrupt ridgeline views from any viewpoints. Streams and oak trees would be protected by design of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section. See Section 3.16, Aesthetics and Visual Quality, for further detail.</p>
<p>Scenic Highway Corridors Viewshed Protection Section 9. Section 9 identifies restrictions to development within a scenic corridor. Any new project must include landscaping to minimize the visual impacts of the project as seen from the right-of-way of any of the scenic highways</p>	<p>Not Applicable for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. No portion of the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternative alignments would cross this plan area.</p> <p>Consistent for the E2 and E2A Build Alternative. While the resource study area1 is within the plan area, the E2 and E2A Build Alternative would not directly traverse the scenic corridors identified within the plan.</p>
Arleta-Pacoima Community Plan (1996) (Part of City of Los Angeles General Plan)	
<p>Protect single-family character of neighborhoods. Preserve and enhance the positive characteristics of the existing residential neighborhoods while providing a variety of housing opportunities with compatible new housing.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. New tracks and temporary construction staging areas would be located within this plan area. The aboveground Build Alternative features within the plan area would be within industrial areas near Interstate 210 and near San Fernando Road. Construction activities and implementation of utility infrastructure may occur near residential areas; however, such features would be located within existing infrastructure and would therefore not change the character of the community. Thus, the project within the plan area would not require conversion of existing residential areas into incompatible land use designations.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E2 and E2A Build Alternative. No portion of the E2 and E2A alignment would cross this plan area.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Maximize development opportunities provided by the future rail transit system while minimizing any adverse impacts.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section proposes an HSR system and associated multimodal linkages.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E2 and E2A Build Alternative. No portion of the E2 and E2A alignment would cross this plan area.</p>
Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon Community Plan (1999) (Part of City of Los Angeles General Plan)	
<p>Policy 1-1.2 Protect existing single-family residential neighborhoods from encroachment by higher density residential and other incompatible uses.</p>	<p>Consistent. New Refined SR14, SR14A, E1 and E1A tracks and construction staging areas would be located within this plan area. There would be no new at-grade tracks within residential neighborhoods in the plan area. The project within the plan area would be mostly within industrial areas near San Fernando Road. The Refined SR14, SR14A, E1 and E1A Build Alternatives would each encounter a residential area located near the Sun Valley Metrolink Station, but the alignment would be contained within the existing rail corridor in this area. Thus project-related improvements within the plan area would not require the conversion of existing residential areas into incompatible land use designations.</p> <p>The E2 and E2A Build Alternatives would be constructed and contained within a tunnel under residential areas within this plan area. In areas of industrial and commercial uses, cut-and-cover construction may be utilized. Thus, construction of the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives would not encroach upon low density residential areas, nor would it require conversion of existing residential areas into incompatible land use designations.</p>
Burbank 2035 General Plan (2013)	
<p>Policy LU 1.3: Maintain and protect Burbank's residential neighborhoods by avoiding encroachment of incompatible land uses and public facilities.</p>	<p>Consistent. Within the city of Burbank, Build Alternative-related improvements would be within existing commercial/industrial areas and/or right-of-way.</p>
<p>Policy LU 1.8: Ensure that development in Burbank is consistent with the land use designations presented in the Land Use Plan and shown on the Land Use Diagram, including individual policies applicable to each land use designation.</p>	<p>Inconsistent for all six Build Alternatives. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would require conversion of planned land uses (specifically industrial, commercial, and public and institutional) to transportation use within Burbank.</p>
<p>Policy M 4.4: Advocate for improved regional bus transit, bus rapid transit, light rail, or heavy rail services linking Burbank's employment and residential centers to the rest of the region.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section proposes an HSR system and a new station in Burbank.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Section 3.14 Agricultural Farmland and Forest Land	
Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 (2015)	
<p>Policy LU 6.3: Encourage low density and low intensity development in rural areas that is compatible with rural community character, preserves open space, and conserves agricultural land.</p>	<p>Inconsistent for all six Build Alternatives. The Build Alternatives may convert parcels that allow for agricultural use lands (as designated in the General Plan) to nonagricultural uses. Refer to Section 3.13, Station Planning, Land Use, and Development, for more information on land uses.</p>
Los Angeles County Antelope Valley Area Plan (2015)	
<p>Policy LU 1.3: Maintain the majority of the unincorporated Antelope Valley as Rural Land, allowing for agriculture, equestrian and animal-keeping uses, and single-family homes on large lots.</p>	<p>Inconsistent for all six Build Alternatives. The Build Alternatives may convert parcels that allow for agricultural use lands (e.g., Rural Land) to nonagricultural uses. Refer to Section 3.13, Station Planning, Land Use, and Development, for more information on land uses.</p>
<p>Policy LU 2.3: Except within economic opportunity areas, limit the amount of potential development in Agricultural Resource Areas, including important farmlands designated by the State of California and historical farmland areas, through appropriate land use designations with very low residential densities, as indicated in the Land Use Policy Map of this Area Plan.</p>	<p>Inconsistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. The Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives could affect Important Farmland designated by the State of California in the Area Plan. The Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternative would avoid Agricultural Resource Areas defined by the Los Angeles County Antelope Valley Area Plan.</p> <p>Consistent for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would avoid impacts on important and historical farmland areas designated by the Los Angeles County Antelope Valley Area Plan and the State of California.</p>
<p>Policy COS 6.2: Limit incompatible nonagricultural uses in Agricultural Resource Areas. Where nonagricultural uses are necessary to meet regional or community needs, require buffering and appropriate development standards to minimize potential conflicts with adjacent agricultural uses.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Build Alternatives would minimize potential conflicts with adjacent agricultural uses.</p>
Los Angeles County Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan (2012)	
<p>Policy LU-1.1.7: Preserve and protect important agricultural resources, including farmland and grazing land, through designating these areas as Open Space or Rural land on the Land Use Map where appropriate.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. The Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would traverse beneath the city of Santa Clarita via tunnel and would avoid surface impacts on agricultural resources.</p>
<p>Policy CO-10.1.9: Preserve forested areas, agricultural lands, wildlife habitat and corridors, wetlands, watersheds, groundwater recharge areas, and other open space that provides natural carbon sequestration benefits.</p>	<p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Alternatives would not traverse the city of Santa Clarita.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Los Angeles County Zoning Code	
Chapter 22.24 – Rural Zones: Chapter 22.24 designates agricultural zones and establishes policies that govern these zones.	Inconsistent for all six Build Alternatives. The Build Alternatives may convert parcels that allow for agricultural uses lands to nonagricultural uses. Refer to Section 3.13, Station Planning, Land Use, and Development, for more information on land uses.
City of Palmdale Zoning Ordinance (1994)	
Chapter 3 – Agricultural Zones: Chapter 3 establishes agricultural zones and the policies that govern these zones.	Inconsistent for all six Build Alternatives. The Build Alternatives may convert parcels that allow for agricultural uses lands to nonagricultural uses. Refer to Section 3.13, Station Planning, Land Use, and Development, for more information on land uses.
Section 3.15 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space	
City of Palmdale General Plan (1993)	
Policies L6.1.1 through L6.2.1: Plan for and reserve land to accommodate uses needed for public benefit, including open space, recreation, public improvements, schools, and community facilities.	Partially Consistent for all six Build Alternatives. Implementation of the six Build Alternatives would result in impacts on recreational facilities within the city of Palmdale. However, mitigation measures would ensure that the character and use of recreation resources is not permanently affected.
Policies ER1.1.1 through ER1.1.8: Create and maintain an open space network throughout the city. Preserve significant natural and human-made open space areas that give Palmdale its distinct form and identity.	Consistent. Although implementation of the six Build Alternatives would result in impacts on parks and recreational facilities within the city of Palmdale, implementation of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would not reduce or degrade the city's existing open space network.
Policies PS 5.4.1 through 5.4.7: Provide adequate park and recreational facilities to meet the needs of existing and future residents.	Consistent. Although the six Build Alternatives would result in the acquisition of existing parkland in Palmdale, adequate compensation would be provided to maintain park and recreational facilities that meet the needs of the public.
Policy PRT 1.1.1 through PRT1.1.4: Provide adequate park and recreational facilities to meet the needs of existing and future residents.	
Policy PRT 2.1.1 through PRT1.2.6: Explore various means of acquiring parkland and seek creative and flexible techniques to accomplish City park goals.	
Objective PRT4.1: Provide multi-use trails, for use by pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians, connecting to existing or currently planned multi-use trails.	Consistent. Construction of the Palmdale Station would include improvements to pedestrian and bike access routes, which, although not recreational in nature, would facilitate improved connections between recreational and commuter bikeways.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 (2015)	
<p>Policies P/R 1.5 through P/R 1.11: Park Management – These policies pertain to the maintenance and efficient utilization of existing park amenities, including accessibility.</p>	<p>Consistent. The six Build Alternatives would not physically affect existing park amenities within the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. Other impacts related to pollutant emissions, noise and vibration, and visual intrusion are described under Section 3.15.6, Environmental Consequences.</p>
<p>Policies P/R 4.1 through P/R 4.6: Improved accessibility and connectivity to a comprehensive trail system including rivers, greenways, and community linkages.</p>	<p>Partially Consistent for the Refined SR14/SR14A Build Alternatives. The Refined SR14 and the SR14A Build Alternatives would cross the Santa Clara River on a viaduct and would not improve or degrade access to the river where future trail expansions are planned. The Refined SR14 Build Alternative would require the realignment of a section of the PCT, the location and extent of which would be decided and approved through coordination between the Authority and the Pacific Crest Trail Association, Bureau of Land Management, a. And USFS. The SR14A Build Alternative would not affect the PCT as it would cross under the trail in a bored tunnel alignment. There are several proposed trails that would be affected by the Refined SR14 Build Alternative and would need to be realigned through coordination with the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation.</p> <p>Partially Consistent for the E1/E1A Build Alternative. The E1 and E1A Build Alternatives would cross a tributary of the Santa Clara River on a viaduct and would not improve or degrade access to the river. The E1 and E1A Build Alternative alignments would tunnel beneath the PCT and would not affect the use of the trail. However, there are several proposed trails in unincorporated Los Angeles County that would be affected by the E1 and E1A Build Alternatives and would need to be realigned in coordination with the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation.</p> <p>Partially Consistent for the E2/E2A Build Alternative. The E2 and E2A Build Alternatives include an elevated alignment that would acquire land for the placement of viaduct footings within a portion of the Hansen Dam Open Space area. The Refined SR14, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives would not affect this resource.</p> <p>The E2 and E2A Build Alternatives would cross a tributary of the Santa Clara River on a viaduct and would tunnel beneath the PCT, thus not affecting the use of these resources. However, there are several proposed trails in unincorporated Los Angeles County that would be affected by the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives and would need to be realigned in coordination with the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation.</p>
<p>Policies P/R 5.1 through P/R 5.7: Protection of historic and natural resources on County park properties.</p>	<p>Consistent. The six Build Alternatives would not result in the destruction or displacement of historic or natural resources on County park properties.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Policies C/NR 1.1 through 1.6: Open space preservation, conservation, and acquisition.	Consistent. The six Build Alternatives would travel through and adjacent to areas of designated open space. Adequate compensation would be provided to offset impacts on open space. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would not physically inhibit future parkland or open space preservation, conservation, or acquisition.
Los Angeles County Antelope Valley Area Plan 2035 (2015)	
Policies M 11.1 through 11.5: A continuous, integrated system of safe and attractive pedestrian routes linking residents to rural town center areas, schools, services, transit, parks, and open space areas.	Consistent. Where applicable, appropriate pedestrian facilities and amenities would be incorporated into the Build Alternatives. Examples include the construction of pedestrian bridges across the Dr. Robert C. Saint Clair Parkway at the planned Palmdale Station.
Policy COS 4.5: Subject to local, state or federal laws, require new development to provide adequate buffers from preserves, sanctuaries, habitat areas, wildlife corridors, State Parks, and National Forest lands, except within Economic Opportunity Areas	Partially Consistent for all six Build Alternatives. The six Build Alternatives would travel through sensitive biological areas within ANF including SGMNM, within the Antelope Valley. However, the six Build Alternatives would be constructed in bored tunnels through the ANF, which would avoid surface impacts. Additionally, project design avoids the utilization of preserves and sensitive ecological areas to the largest extent possible.
Policies COS 18.1 through 18.5: Permanently preserve open space areas throughout the Antelope Valley.	Consistent for the Refined SR14/SR14A Build Alternative. The Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternative alignments would traverse through undeveloped land within the Antelope Valley. However, this land does not meet the criteria of “open space” as defined in the Antelope Valley Area Plan. Partially Consistent for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. A small section of the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternative alignments would traverse through undeveloped land and open space within the Antelope Valley. However, the station and Maintenance Facility along the alignment would be located in urban centers (Lancaster and Palmdale) where preserved open space would not be affected by increased development.
Policies PS 8.1 through 8.9: These policies focus on the maintenance, acquisition, and promotion of parks and recreation resources.	Partially. The Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would result in impacts on parks and recreational facilities within the Antelope Valley. However, Palmdale to Burbank Project Section mitigation measures would ensure that residents would still enjoy access to parks and recreational facilities. Additionally, construction of the Palmdale and Burbank Stations would include improvements to pedestrian and bike access routes, which are consistent with the policy to provide bicycle routes for recreational use.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Los Angeles County Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan (2012)	
<p>Policies 9.1.1 through 9.1.15: Develop new parklands throughout the Santa Clarita Valley, with priority given to locations that are not now adequately served, and encompassing a diversity of park types and functions (including passive and active areas) in consideration of the recreational needs of residents to be served by each park.</p> <p>Policies 10.1.1 through 10.2.5: Identify areas throughout the Santa Clarita Valley, which should be preserved as open space in order to conserve significant resources for long-term community benefit.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14/SR14A Build Alternative. The Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would result in minor permanent acquisitions. The Authority would ensure that adequate compensation is provided for recreation resource acquisitions.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not pass through the land included in the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan.</p>
Los Angeles Department of City Planning Sun Valley / La Tuna Canyon Community Plan (1999)	
<p>Objective 4-1: To conserve, maintain, and better utilize existing recreational and park facilities that promote the recreational experience.</p>	<p>Partially Consistent for all six Build Alternatives. The six Build Alternatives would pass through desirable open space and parkland within the Sun Valley/La Tuna planning area. Impacts on recreation resources would be mitigated to ensure the continued operation and maintenance of existing facilities.</p>
<p>Policy 4-1.1: Preserve and improve the existing recreational facilities and park space.</p>	<p>Consistent. The six Build Alternatives would not involve the acquisition of parkland within the Sun Valley/La Tuna planning area.</p>
<p>Policy 5-1.4: Preserve as much of remaining undeveloped hillside land, as feasible, for open space and recreational uses.</p>	<p>Consistent. Once the six Build Alternatives exit the tunnel beneath the San Gabriel Mountains, all would remain within urbanized areas of Los Angeles and would not pass over, or through, additional undeveloped hillside within the Sun Valley/La Tuna Canyon communities.</p>
Sunland - Tujunga - Lake View Terrace - Shadow Hills - East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan (1997)	
<p>Policies 4-1.1 through 4-3.1: These policies pertain to the conservation, maintenance, and expansion/creation of parkland.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. The Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives would not result in the acquisition of parkland designated by the plan.</p>
<p>Policies 5-1.1 through 5-1.5: Preserve existing open space and scenic corridors, and where possible, create new open space.</p>	<p>Partially Consistent for the E2/E2A Build Alternative. Although the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives would affect the Hansen Dam Open Space area, the alignment would not result in the permanent closure of this resource.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
City of Santa Clarita General Plan (2011)	
<p>Policies CP3.4.1 through CP3.4.4: Ensure that development in the Santa Clarita Valley does not adversely affect habitat within the adjacent National Forest lands.</p>	<p>Partially Consistent for the Refined SR14/SR14A Build Alternative. The Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would travel through the ANF within bored tunnels, significantly reducing surface impacts on the forest.</p> <p>Design measures would ensure that Build Alternative features that are above grade would be located in in-holdings or less sensitive areas of the forest. Additionally, the Authority and USFS would coordinate to decide upon the appropriate compensation for recreation resource acquisitions within the resource, if any.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not travel through the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan area.</p>
<p>Policies CO9.1.1 through CO10.2.5: Preservation of open space to meet the community's multiple objectives for resource preservation.</p>	<p>Partially Consistent for the Refined SR14/SR14A Build Alternative. The Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would travel through areas of designated open space within the Santa Clarita Valley. The Authority and applicable jurisdictions would coordinate to decide upon adequate compensation for permanent acquisition of open space resources.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not travel through the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan.</p>
City of Los Angeles General Plan (1973)	
<p>The designation of an area as either open space land or desirable open space is not intended to preclude the development of needed transportation facilities. Such transportation facilities traversing public park properties are subject to various laws controlling development.</p>	<p>Consistent. Newly designated open space implemented as mitigation for the six Build Alternatives would not preclude the development of needed transportation projects. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would comply with applicable laws and regulations.</p>
City of Burbank 2035 General Plan (2013)	
<p>Policies 2.1 through 4.2, 4.4, and 4.5: These policies focus on providing adequate park and recreational amenities to all residents within Burbank, as well as ensure that the public transit system connects parks and recreational facilities to the rest of the community.</p>	<p>Consistent. The six Build Alternatives would not significantly alter existing parks or recreation resources within the Burbank Subsection. Additionally, the station area development policies include compact pedestrian-oriented design that promotes walking, bicycling, and transit access with streetscapes that include landscaping, small parks, and pedestrian spaces, all of which would connect parks, recreation centers, and the rest of the community.</p>
<p>Policies 5.1 through 6.4: Creation of a comprehensive trails network, and maintenance of open space resources.</p>	<p>Consistent. The six Build Alternatives would not intersect or require the acquisition of trails within Burbank.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Section 3.16 Aesthetics and Visual Quality	
City of Lancaster General Plan (2009)	
<p>Objective 3.8: Preserve and enhance important views within the city, and significant visual features that are visible from the city of Lancaster.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy 3.8.1: Preserve views of surrounding ridgelines, slope areas and hilltops, and other scenic vistas. ▪ Specific Actions for Policy 3.8.1(a): Encourage the creation of vistas and view corridors of community or neighborhood value during the development review process, through the siting of buildings to avoid blocking views and view corridors. <p>Policy 3.8.2: Explore the potential for establishing scenic corridors within the study area.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would be at grade through the Maintenance Facility area and would not block views of surrounding ridgelines, slope areas and hilltops, or other scenic vistas. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would not affect the city of Lancaster’s potential for establishing scenic corridors as the project would not be in scenic areas of Lancaster.</p>
<p>Policy 4.3.3: Ensure that the provision of noise attenuation does not create significant negative visual impacts.</p> <p>Specific Action for Policy 4.3.3(a), Site Design: Require landscaping treatment to be provided in conjunction with noise barriers to provide visual relief and to reduce aesthetic impacts.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would provide design treatments to sound barriers, including transparent and/or neutral materials so as not to block views or draw attention, as well as installation of vegetation appropriate to the visual context of the area.</p>
<p>Policy 19.2.4: Provide buffers to soften the interface between conflicting land uses and intensities.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would implement several mitigation measures to provide landscape treatments and screening for project elements (AVR-MM #4 through AVR-MM#6). Design standards incorporated into the project (AVR-IAMF#1 and AVR-IAMF#2) would also integrate structures within the community and increase compatibility of HSR infrastructure with the local context.</p>
Lancaster Master Environmental Assessment (2009)	
<p>Lists five scenic resources in the city: Foothills Area, Quartz Hill, Little Buttes, Piute Ponds, and Little Rock Wash.</p> <p>Identifies local roadways which could potentially serve as scenic routes: Antelope Valley Freeway between Avenue A to Avenue M, Avenue K from the Antelope Valley Freeway to 110th Street West, Avenue M between the Antelope Valley Freeway and 60th Street West, 60th Street West between Avenue K and Avenue M, and 90th Street West.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would not be in the immediate vicinity of the identified resources.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Palmdale General Plan (1993)	
<p>Policy L1.4.3: Establish the following standards for development in hillside areas:</p> <p>Development in hillside areas should minimize grading, conform to natural topography, preserve ridgelines, and exhibit sensitivity to natural landforms.</p> <p>Development should be restricted on natural slopes of 50 percent and greater.</p> <p>Visually prominent ridges and hillsides should be retained in a natural condition.</p> <p>Flexibility in land use regulations may be permitted when it can be demonstrated that such flexibility will meet hillside management objectives.</p>	<p>Consistent. Through the city of Palmdale, the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would be located on relatively level terrain near existing transportation corridors and would not be located in hillsides areas.</p>
<p>Objective L3.6: Maintain the integrity, safety, and attractiveness of existing residential neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would incorporate principles of crime prevention through design under AVR-MM#3 and would screen project features with vegetation adjacent to residential areas under AVR-MM#4.</p>
<p>Goal ER1: Preserve significant natural and human-made open space areas that give Palmdale its distinct form and identity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objective ER1.2: Protect scenic viewsheds both to and from the city of Palmdale. <p>Policy ER1.2.1: New development with the potential to substantially obscure or negatively alter the scenic backdrop to the city should be discouraged. “Scenic backdrop” refers to the significant ridgelines of the San Gabriel Mountains, the Sierra Pelona, and the Ritter and Portal Ridges that form the city’s skyline views.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would be at grade through the Palmdale Subsection and would, therefore, not have the potential to block scenic views.</p>
<p>Policies CD1.1.1 through CD10.9.2 discuss specific guidelines related to building character and design, materials, colors, placement, and architectural style in relation to surrounding buildings, as well as the appearance of walls, fences, and lighting.</p>	<p>Consistent. IAMFs would focus on coordination with local jurisdictions to integrate project design with the local context to the extent possible.</p>
Palmdale Transit Village Specific Plan (2007)	
<p>Encourages the creation of pedestrian-friendly and bicycle-friendly streets and provides increased open space through the extension of an existing greenway into the <i>Palmdale Transit Village Specific Plan</i> area.</p>	<p>Consistent. The plan discusses the California HSR System, which would maintain pedestrian and bicycle access and enhance connectivity through HSR. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would not preclude extension of existing open space.</p>
Palmdale Trade and Commerce Specific Plan (2014)	
<p>Goals include establishing an attractive, mixed-use activity center to complement the city of Palmdale’s residential development and encouraging the use of intermodal transportation within the <i>Palmdale Trade and Commerce Specific Plan</i> area.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section proposes HSR, which would enhance intermodal transportation for the community.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
City of Palmdale Zoning Ordinance (2019)	
<p>Chapter 8, General Standards of Development.</p> <p>Allow for the infill and redevelopment of areas at similar scale and character;</p> <p>Maintain and enhance significant environmental and visual resources; and</p> <p>Establish the city of Palmdale as a distinctive community with a high quality of life and a visually pleasing, secure environment for city residents and businesses.</p>	<p>Consistent. IAMFs would focus on coordination with local jurisdictions to integrate project design with the local context to the extent possible.</p>
Los Angeles County Antelope Valley Area Plan (2015)	
<p>Policy COS 5.1: Identify and protect natural landforms and vistas with significant visual value, such as the California Poppy Preserve, by designating them as Scenic Resource Areas.</p>	<p>Inconsistent for all six Build Alternatives. Some features of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section (e.g., elevated guideways) would partially obstruct some scenic views.</p>
<p>Policy COS 5.4: Require appropriate development standards in Hillside Management Areas that minimize grading and alteration of the land’s natural contours, ensure that development pads mimic natural contours, and ensure that individual structures are appropriately designed to minimize visual impacts.</p>	<p>Inconsistent for all six Build Alternatives. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would require major grading in some areas to accommodate tunnel portals, including through designated Hillside Management Areas.</p>
<p>Policy COS 5.6: Restrict development on buttes and designated significant ridgelines by requiring appropriate buffer zones.</p>	<p>Inconsistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. Portions of the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would be located above ground within designated significant ridgeline areas. However, most of the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternative alignments would be underground in a tunnel through designated significant ridgeline areas. Where visible, the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would follow the existing SR 14 transportation corridor. When visible, HSR infrastructure would not substantially block views.</p> <p>Consistent for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternative alignments would be underground in a tunnel through designated significant ridgeline areas and would, therefore, not be visible.</p>
<p>Policy COS 5.7: Ensure that incompatible development is discouraged in designated Scenic Drives by developing and implementing development standards and guidelines for development within identified viewsheds of these routes (Map 4.2: Antelope Valley Scenic Drives).</p>	<p>Inconsistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. The Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would be visible from portions of SR 14 designated as a scenic drive; the SR14A Build Alternative alignment would have less at-grade and elevated trackway visible from SR 14 than the Refined SR14 Build Alternative.</p> <p>Consistent for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternative alignments would be underground in a tunnel through this area and would, therefore, not be visible within the viewshed of the SR 14 designated scenic drive.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 (2015)	
Policy C/NR 13.1: Protect scenic resources through land use regulations that mitigate development impacts.	Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section includes AVR-MM#1 through AVR-MM#6 to mitigate impacts on visual resources.
Policy C/NR 13.2: Protect ridgelines from incompatible development that diminishes their scenic value.	<p>Inconsistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. The Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would partially obstruct views of scenic ridgelines in some areas.</p> <p>Consistent for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternative alignments would be underground in tunnels in areas with views of scenic ridgelines.</p>
Policy C/NR 13.3: Reduce light trespass, light pollution, and other threats to scenic resources.	Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would include AVR-MM#2 to minimize light disturbance during construction.
Policy C/NR 13.4: Encourage developments to be designed to create a consistent visual relationship with the natural terrain and vegetation.	Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section IAMFs would include coordination with local jurisdictions to develop contextually appropriate project design. As described in AVR-MM#6, the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would incorporate transparent or neutral-colored building materials that would blend with their surroundings and, as described in AVR#4 and AVR#5, also would include measures to incorporate vegetation and landscaping wherever possible.
Policy C/NR 13.5: Encourage required grading to be compatible with the existing terrain.	Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would require major grading in some areas to accommodate tunnel portals.
Policy C/NR 13.8: Manage development in Hillside Management Areas to protect their natural and scenic character and minimize risks from natural hazards, such as fire, flood, erosion, and landslides.	<p>Inconsistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. The Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would partially obstruct scenic ridgelines in some areas.</p> <p>Consistent for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternative alignments would be underground in tunnels in areas with scenic ridgelines.</p>
Los Angeles County Zoning Code (2019)	
Los Angeles County Zoning Code Title 22 (2012) regulates the design of fencing, signage, lighting, and architecture within the county limits. The County Zoning Code establishes the numerous different zoning areas of Los Angeles County, and ensures that development projects adhere to the regulations established for each zone.	Consistent. IAMFs would focus on coordination with local jurisdictions to integrate project design with the local context to the extent possible.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
City of Santa Clarita General Plan (2011)	
<p>Policy LU 1.1.1: Where appropriate, protect mountains and foothills surrounding the Santa Clarita Valley floor from urban development by designating these areas as Open Space or Non-Urban uses on the Land Use Map.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. Most of the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would be underground in a tunnel. Where visible, the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would follow the existing SR 14 transportation corridor. One overcrossing structure near Soledad Canyon Road would be visible but would not substantially block views.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not pass through Santa Clarita.</p>
<p>Policy LU 1.1.4: Preserve community character by maintaining natural features that act as natural boundaries between developed areas, including significant ridgelines, canyons, rivers and drainage courses, riparian areas, topographical features, habitat preserves, or other similar features, where appropriate.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. Most of the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would be underground in a tunnel. Where visible, the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would follow the existing SR 14 transportation corridor. One overcrossing structure near Soledad Canyon Road would be visible but would not substantially block views.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not pass through Santa Clarita.</p>
<p>Policy LU 1.2.10: In Agua Dulce, recognize the scenic and environmental qualities of Vasquez Rocks in future planning; protect the existing rural lifestyle while providing opportunities to enhance the village center; and provide additional services to residents; and maintain community character in accordance with the Agua Dulce Community Standards District.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. The Refined SR14 Build Alternative would not significantly impinge upon the scenic qualities of Vasquez Rocks, as shown in KVP 3.8. In this area, the SR14A Build Alternative would be underground in a tunnel and would avoid impacting the scenic qualities of Vasquez Rock.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not pass through Santa Clarita.</p>
<p>Policy LU 1.3.2: Substantially retain the integrity and natural grade elevations of significant natural ridgelines and prominent landforms that form the Santa Clarita Valley's skyline backdrop.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. Most of the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would be underground in a tunnel. Where visible, the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would follow the existing SR 14 transportation corridor. One overcrossing structure near Soledad Canyon Road would be visible but would not substantially block views.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not pass through Santa Clarita.</p>
<p>Policy LU 1.3.3: Discourage development on ridgelines and lands containing 50% slopes so that these areas are maintained as natural open space.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. The Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would not be located aboveground on steep topography.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not pass through Santa Clarita.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Policy LU 2.2.1: Identify areas of scenic or aesthetic value to the community and minimize the designation of uses in these areas that would diminish their aesthetic quality.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. Most of the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would be underground in a tunnel. Where visible, the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would follow the existing SR 14 transportation corridor. One overcrossing structure near Soledad Canyon Road would be visible but would not substantially block views.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not pass through Santa Clarita.</p>
<p>Policy LU 6.1.1: Designate ridgelines throughout the planning area and preserve these ridgelines from development by encouraging a minimum distance for grading and development from these ridgelines of 50 feet, or more, if determined preferable by the reviewing authority based on site conditions.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. Most of the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternative s would be underground in a tunnel. Where visible, the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would follow the existing SR 14 transportation corridor. One overcrossing structure near Soledad Canyon Road would be visible but would not substantially block views.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not pass through Santa Clarita.</p>
<p>Policy LU 6.5.1: Require use of high quality, durable, and natural-appearing building materials pursuant to applicable ordinances.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternative. As described in AVR-MM#6, the Build Alternatives would incorporate transparent or neutral-colored building materials that would blend with their surroundings.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not pass through Santa Clarita.</p>
<p>Policy CO 2.2.1: Locate development and designate land uses to minimize the impact on the Santa Clarita Valley's topography, minimizing grading and emphasizing the use of development pads that mimic the natural topography in lieu of repetitive flat pads, to the extent feasible.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. Most of the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would be underground in a tunnel. Where visible, the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would follow the existing SR 14 transportation corridor. One overcrossing structure near Soledad Canyon Road would be visible but would not substantially block views.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not pass through Santa Clarita.</p>
<p>Policy CO 2.2.3: Preserve designated natural ridgelines from development by ensuring a minimum distance for grading and development from these ridgelines of 50 feet or more if determined appropriate by the reviewing authority based on site conditions, to maintain the Santa Clarita Valley's distinctive community character and preserve the scenic setting.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. Most of the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternative alignments would be underground in a tunnel. Where visible, the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would follow the existing SR 14 transportation corridor. One overcrossing structure near Soledad Canyon Road would be visible but would not substantially block views.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not pass through Santa Clarita.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Policy CO 2.2.6: Encourage building and grading designs that conform to the natural grade, avoiding the use of large retaining walls and build-up walls that are visible from off site, to the extent feasible and practicable.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. Most of the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would be underground in a tunnel. Where visible, the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would follow the existing SR 14 transportation corridor. One overcrossing structure near Soledad Canyon Road would be visible but would not substantially block views. The Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would include filling of the Vulcan Mine and restoring the site to a more natural finished grade.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not pass through Santa Clarita.</p>
<p>Policy CO 6.1.2: Preserve significant ridgelines as a scenic backdrop throughout the community by maintaining natural grades and vegetation.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. Most of the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would be underground in a tunnel. Where visible, the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would follow the existing SR 14 transportation corridor. One overcrossing structure near Soledad Canyon Road would be visible but would not substantially block views.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not pass through Santa Clarita.</p>
<p>Policy CO 6.1.3: Protect the scenic quality of unique geologic features throughout the planning area, such as Vasquez Rocks, by including these features within park and open space land, where possible.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. The Refined SR14 Build Alternative would not significantly impinge upon the scenic qualities of Vasquez Rocks, as shown in KVP 3.8. In this area, the SR14A Build Alternative would be underground in a tunnel and would avoid impacting the scenic qualities of Vasquez Rock.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2 and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not pass through Santa Clarita.</p>
<p>Policy CO 6.4.1: Preserve scenic habitat areas within designated open space or parkland, wherever possible.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. The Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would not substantially impinge upon scenic habitat areas.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2 and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2 and E2A Build Alternatives would not pass through Santa Clarita.</p>
<p>Policy CO 6.4.2: Through the development review process, ensure that new development preserves scenic habitat areas to the extent feasible.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. The Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would not substantially impinge upon scenic habitat areas.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not pass through Santa Clarita.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Policy CO 6.5.1: In approving new development projects, consider scenic views at major entry points to the Santa Clarita Valley, including gateways located at Newhall Pass along Lake Hughes Road, Route 126, Bouquet Canyon Road, Sierra Highway, SR 14, and other locations as deemed appropriate by the reviewing authority.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. The Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would not be located in views looking toward the Santa Clarita Valley at the locations described in the policy.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2 and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not pass through Santa Clarita.</p>
Santa Clarita Community Character and Design Guidelines (2009)	
<p>The guidelines are intended to work with the City of Santa Clarita Beautification Master Plan, which focuses on landscaping, fencing, monument, and signage design both at the community and regional scale. Together these documents are intended to influence the aesthetic character in Santa Clarita.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. The Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would incorporate IAMFs, which would include coordination with local jurisdictions to develop contextually appropriate project design.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2 and E2A Build Alternatives would not pass through Santa Clarita.</p>
Santa Clarita Municipal Code (2019)	
<p>Chapter 16.07, Design Standards, and 17.51, Property Development Standards, include guidelines relevant to the design of the alignment, fencing, signage, lighting, and architecture of the portions of the Build Alternatives located within the Santa Clarita city limits. Additionally, portions of the code relevant to oak tree preservation may be found in Chapter 17.51.040.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. The Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives would incorporate IAMFs, which would include coordination with local jurisdictions to develop contextually appropriate project design.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not pass through Santa Clarita.</p>
Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan Update – One Valley, One Vision (2012)	
<p>The Land Use and Conservation and Open Space elements of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan mimic those contained in the Land Use and Conservation and Open Space elements of the City of Santa Clarita General Plan. This coordinated effort is part of the “One Valley, One Vision” planning and policy guidance.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives. See City of Santa Clarita General Plan section above.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives. The E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives would not pass through Santa Clarita.</p>
City of Los Angeles General Plan (2010)	
<p>The City of Los Angeles General Plan consists of 11 elements that apply citywide, and a land use plan for each of the 35 community plan areas in the city. Many community plan areas emphasize the preservation and protection of various scenic corridors, highways, prominent ridgelines, and other visual resources.</p>	<p>Consistent. IAMFs would focus on coordination with local jurisdictions to integrate project design with the local context to the extent possible.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Los Angeles Municipal Code (2019)	
<p>City of Los Angeles Municipal Code Ordinance # 177404 assures the protection of and regulates the removal of protected trees. Protected trees include any of the following species, which measure 4 inches or more in cumulative diameter and 4½ feet above the ground level at the base of the tree:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oak tree including Valley Oak (<i>Quercus lobata</i>) and California Live Oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>), or any other tree of the oak genus indigenous to California but excluding the Scrub Oak (<i>Quercus acemo</i>) • Southern California Black Walnut (<i>Juglans californica</i> var. <i>californica</i>) • Western Sycamore (<i>Platanus acemose</i>) • California Bay (<i>Umbellularia californica</i>) <p>In addition, Los Angeles Municipal Code Chapters 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9 are relevant to the aesthetics and visual quality analysis for the Build Alternatives. In general, they regulate the maximum height and setbacks for structures.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Build Alternatives would cross through a heavily urbanized portion of the city of Los Angeles. IAMFs would ensure impacts to protected trees are minimized (refer to Section 3.7, Biological and Aquatic Resources, for further discussion of protected trees) In addition, IAMFs would focus on coordination with local jurisdictions to integrate project design with the local context to the extent possible.</p>
City of Burbank 2035 General Plan (2013)	
<p>Land Use Element Policy 3.2: Preserve unique neighborhoods and use specific plans to distinguish neighborhoods and districts by character and appearance and address physical and visual distinction, architecture, edge and entry treatment, landscape, streetscape, and other elements.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section IAMFs would include coordination with local jurisdictions to develop contextually appropriate project design. Moreover, the HSR station proposed to be located in Burbank would be designed to be an attractive architectural element that would add visual interest to the streetscape (see AVR-MM#3).</p>
<p>Land Use Element Policy 3.4: Avoid abrupt changes in density, intensity, scale, and height and provide gradual transitions between different development types.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would follow existing transportation corridors in Burbank, thereby complementing existing infrastructure.</p>
<p>Land Use Element Policy 3.5: Ensure that architecture and site design are high quality, creative, complementary to Burbank’s character, and compatible with surrounding development and public spaces.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section IAMFs would include coordination with local jurisdictions to develop contextually appropriate project design. Moreover, the HSR station proposed to be located in Burbank would be designed to be an attractive architectural element that would add visual interest to the streetscape (see AVR-MM#3).</p>
<p>Land Use Element Policy 3.7: Ensure that lots and buildings appropriately interact with and address public streets.</p>	<p>Consistent. HSR stations would be designed to be attractive architectural elements that would add visual interest to the streetscape (see AVR-MM#3).</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Land Use Element Policy 3.11: Carefully consider the evolution of community character over time. Evaluate projects with regard to their impact on historic character, their role in shaping the desired future community character, and how future generations will view today's Burbank.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section IAMFs would include coordination with local jurisdictions to develop contextually appropriate project design. Moreover, the HSR station proposed to be located in Burbank would be designed to be an attractive architectural element that would add visual interest to the streetscape (see AVR-MM#3).</p>
<p>San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan (part of the City of Los Angeles General Plan, adopted in 2004)</p>	
<p>Prominent Ridgeline Section 6. A mountain ridge as shown on Map No. 2, that has significant aesthetic quality as a scenic resource, defines a region or is unique and visually prominent as determined by the Director of Planning or the Advisory Agency. Prominent Ridgelines are identified by a line connecting the series of elevation points running through the center of the long axis of the ridge, including endpoint elevations, which are provided to indicate the approximate terminus of the Prominent Ridgeline. No Project may be constructed within any Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area or portion of the area except as permitted pursuant to Section 6 B. (Section 6B: Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsection A above, a Project may encroach into the Prominent Ridgeline Protection Area where it can be demonstrated that: All or most of the Prominent Ridgeline remains undisturbed; and the Project incorporates design elements that consider the natural terrain, utilizes a minimum of grading, and protects streams and oak trees (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>, <i>Q. lobata</i>) to the extent feasible; and the project is placed or constructed to preclude silhouettes against the skyline above the Prominent Ridgeline of the site.</p>	<p>Not Applicable for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. No portion of the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, or E1A Build Alternatives would cross through this plan area.</p> <p>Consistent for the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives. The plan identifies prominent ridgelines and prohibits grading, vegetation removal, and improvements within prominent ridgeline areas. Views of the prominent ridgelines would be available from the alignment, but the proposed alignment would not alter or disrupt ridgeline views from viewpoints. Streams and oak trees would be protected by project design.</p>
<p>Scenic Highway Corridors Viewshed Protection Section 9. Section 9 identifies restrictions to development within a scenic corridor. Any new project must include landscaping to minimize the visual impacts of the project as seen from the right-of-way of any of the scenic highways.</p>	<p>Not Applicable for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. No portion of the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, or E1A Build Alternatives would cross through this plan area.</p> <p>Consistent for the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives. While the RSA is within the plan area, the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives would not directly traverse the scenic corridors identified within the plan.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Section 3.17 Cultural Resources	
Southern California Association of Governments Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016)	
<p>The Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy discusses cultural resources and includes mitigation measures in order to minimize impacts on historical and archaeological features. When there is a federal nexus, mitigation measures applied pertain to coordination with local governments and consultation with the OHP, application of design measures to avoid historic resources, and compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050 and Sections 18950–18961 in the event of discovery of human remains.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project proposes an HSR system that would improve mobility, accessibility, and reduce existing vehicular emissions. The California HSR System and the Southern California Association of Governments Regional Transportation Plan both include measures to identify and preserve cultural resources. Section 3.17.5.3 and Section 3.17.8 list IAMFs and mitigation measures implemented by the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section.</p>
City of Palmdale General Plan (1993) Environmental Resources Element	
<p>Policy ER.7.1.1: Identify and recognize historic landmarks from Palmdale’s past.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project utilized a variety of efforts to identify archeological and historic built resources within the Palmdale Subsection APE. See Section 3.17.5.2 for a detailed description of resource identification efforts.</p>
<p>Policy ER7.1.2: Promote maintenance, rehabilitation, and appropriate reuse of identified landmarks where feasible.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of archaeological and historic built resources in the MOA and applicable treatment plan.</p>
<p>Policy ER7.1.3: Require that new development protects significant historic, paleontological, or archaeological resources, or provides for other appropriate mitigation.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources within the archaeological and historic built APEs. Appropriate mitigation is provided where feasible. Paleontological resources are discussed in the <i>Palmdale to Burbank Project Section Geology and Paleontological Technical Reports</i>.</p>
<p>Policy ER7.1.4: Develop and maintain a cultural sensitivity map. Require special studies/surveys to be prepared for any development proposals in areas reasonably suspected of containing cultural resources, or as indicated on the sensitivity map.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project utilizes geo-referencing and GIS to accurately locate and map resources within the APE. Maps identifying the location of known archaeological resources were excluded from this chapter section because California state and federal laws prohibit the disclosure of information pertaining to the location of sensitive cultural resources. See Section 3.17.5.2 for a more detailed discussion of resource mapping. Furthermore, per CUL-IAMF#1, a geospatial layer and archaeological sensitivity map would be prepared prior to construction.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Policy ER7.1.5: When human remains suspected to be of Native American origin are discovered, cooperate with the Native American Heritage Commission and any local Native American groups to determine the most appropriate disposition of the human remains and any associated grave goods.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System features mitigation measures that account for the discovery of human remains. If human remains, specifically of Native American descent, are discovered, the Authority would halt work and consult with the Native American Heritage Commission.</p>
<p>Policy ER7.1.6: Cooperate with private and public entities whose goals are to protect and preserve historic landmarks and important cultural resources.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System has consulted and cooperated with private and public entities to identify and evaluate historic built and archaeological resources. See Table 3.17-4 for a detailed list of public outreach and coordination efforts.</p>
<p>Policy ER7.1.8: Discourage historic landmark properties from being altered in such a manner as to significantly reduce their cultural value to the community.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of archaeological and historic built resources in the MOA and applicable treatment plan.</p>
<p>City of Palmdale General Plan (1993) Circulation Element</p>	
<p>The City of Palmdale Circulation Element discusses the need to protect cultural resources during the construction of future circulation system.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project proposes an HSR system that would expand the existing circulation system and would preserve cultural resources during construction and operations to the extent feasible. Section 3.17.5.3 and Section 3.17.8 list the IAMFs and mitigation measures implemented by the project.</p>
<p>Palmdale Transit Village Specific Plan (2007)</p>	
<p>Palmdale Transit Village Specific Plan, Implementation, 6.6.2 Construction Procedures: The Palmdale Transit Village Specific Plan is a mixed-use transit-oriented development plan for the area near the Palmdale Transportation Center, which is adjacent to downtown Palmdale. The specific plan incorporates guidelines on finding prehistoric archaeological materials during construction.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System features mitigation measures that account for archaeological discoveries. In the event of an unanticipated archaeological discovery, the contractor would halt work within 50 feet of the property to avoid or minimize harm to the resource. See CUL-MM#1: for the detailed protocol pertaining to archaeological discoveries.</p>
<p>City of Palmdale Avenue S Corridor Plan (1998)</p>	
<p>Goal ER7: Protect historical and culturally significant resources which contribute to the community's sense of history.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of archaeological and historic built resources in the PA and applicable MOA.</p>
<p>Objective E3: Preserve the significant historical resources which are present within the Avenue S Corridor.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System proposes HSR that would pass through the Avenue S Corridor Plan area. The project provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of archaeological and historic built resources in the PA and applicable MOA.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
City of Burbank 2035 General Plan (2013) Open Space and Conservation Element	
Policy 1.2: Involve community groups in the identification, acquisition, and management of natural resource areas, recreation facilities, historical and cultural sites, and aesthetic and beautification programs.	Consistent. The California HSR System has consulted and cooperated with private and public entities to identify and evaluate historic built and archaeological resources. See Table 3.17-4 for a detailed list of cooperation and coordination efforts.
Policy 6.1: Recognize and maintain cultural, historical, archaeological, and paleontological structures and sites essential for community life and identity.	Consistent. The California HSR System utilizes a number of strategies to identify, map, and evaluate cultural resources within the archaeological and historic built APEs. See Section 3.17.5.2 for a detailed discussion of resource identification efforts conducted on behalf of the project. The California HSR System provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of archaeological and historic built resources in the MOA and applicable treatment plans.
Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 (2015) Conservation and Natural Resources Element	
Los Angeles County General Plan 2035, Conservation and Natural Resources Element, Goal C/NR 14 and Policies 14.1 through 14.6 (Los Angeles County 2015)	Consistent. The California HSR System provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of archaeological and historic built resources in the MOA and applicable treatment plans.
Policy C/NR 14.2: Support an inter-jurisdictional collaborative system that protects and enhances historic, cultural, and paleontological resources.	Consistent. The California HSR System has consulted and cooperated with private and public entities to identify, evaluate, and protect cultural resources located within the archaeological and historic built APEs. See Table 3.17-4 for a detailed list of the collaborative networking efforts.
Policy C/NR 14.3: Support the preservation and rehabilitation of historic buildings.	Consistent. The California HSR System provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided or inadvertent damage to the historic property takes place, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of historic built resources in the MOA and applicable treatment plans.
Policy C/NR 14.4: Ensure proper notification procedures to Native American tribes in accordance with Senate Bill 18 (2004).	Consistent. In addition to coordination efforts with public agencies and private entities, the Authority has actively engaged tribal governments throughout the project planning process. See Section 3.17.4.2 and Table 3.17-5 for additional information and a summary of key milestones and outreach efforts undertaken to date.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Policy C/NR 14.6: Ensure proper notification and recovery processes are carried out for development on or near historic, cultural, and paleontological resources.</p>	<p>Consistent. As discussed above, the Authority has actively engaged tribal governments on behalf of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section. See Section 3.17.4.2 for a more detailed discussion of coordination efforts.</p> <p>The project features IAMFs that would prepare a pre-construction sensitivity map, surveys, an archaeological monitoring plan, and pre-construction conditions assessments to preserve cultural resources. Mitigation measures proposed for the project would lessen impacts on resources where feasible. See CUL-MM#2 through CUL-MM#4 for the detailed protocols pertaining to the protection, recovery, or relocation of cultural resources.</p>
Los Angeles County Zoning Code, Historic Preservation Ordinance (2019)	
<p>Policies LU-2.2.2: Identify sites and areas with historical or cultural value to the community, and ensure that uses in or adjacent to these areas will not affect their historical integrity.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources located within the archaeological and historic built APES for the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section.</p> <p>Where impacts cannot be avoided, or inadvertent damage to the historic property takes place, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of historic built resources in the MOA and applicable treatment plans.</p>
<p>Objective LU-6.4: Protect the Santa Clarita Valley's significant historical and cultural resources in a scenic setting through appropriate land use designations.</p>	<p>Potentially Inconsistent. Although the California HSR System evaluates cultural resources regardless of the resource's visual setting, implementation of the Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternatives may present visual impacts during construction and/or once the project is operational.</p> <p>With implementation of CUL-IAMF#6, pre-construction conditions assessments would be prepared for historic built resources that may result in visual impacts associated with construction or operations of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of historic built resources in the MOA and applicable treatment plans. This policy does not apply to the E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternatives because they would not be constructed through the Santa Clarita Valley area.</p>
<p>Policy LU-6.4.3: Maintain cultural resources from pre-historical Native American habitation and historical settlement in the areas around Vasquez Rocks, Elsmere Canyon, and along the Santa Clara River, through designation of these areas as Open Space on the Land Use Map.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Refined SR14 and SR14A Build Alternative alignments would run in the vicinity of Vasquez Rocks. The project provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources to the extent feasible. Where impacts could not be avoided, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of archaeological and historic built resources in the MOA and applicable treatment plans.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Policy CO-5.1.2: Review any proposed alterations to cultural and historic sites identified in Table CO-1 or other sites which are so designated, based on the guidelines contained in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 C.F.R. 68), or other adopted County guidelines.</p>	<p>Consistent. The cultural technical reports prepared for the California HSR System would inform the MOA and treatment plans. Adherence to the Section 106 process requires that effects on historic properties be taken into consideration in any project with a federal nexus. Historic properties within the archaeological and historic built APEs are identified and evaluated using DPR Series 523 forms or streamlined documentation in accordance with Attachment D of the PA and Cultural Resources Technical Guidance Memorandum #7. Preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction treatment of historic properties is consistent with 36 C.F.R. 68.</p>
<p>Policy CO-5.1.3: As new information about other potentially significant historical and cultural sites becomes available, update the Cultural and Historical Resources Inventory and apply appropriate measures to all identified sites to protect their historical and cultural integrity.</p>	<p>Consistent. The cultural technical reports prepared for the California HSR System would inform the MOA and treatment plans. Adherence to the Section 106 process requires that effects on historic properties be taken into consideration in any project with a federal nexus. Historic properties within the archaeological and historic built APEs are identified and evaluated using DPR Series 523 forms or streamlined documentation in accordance with Attachment D of the PA and Cultural Resources Technical Guidance Memorandum #7. Preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction treatment of historic properties is consistent with 36 C.F.R. 68.</p>
<p>Objective CO-5.3: Encourage conservation and preservation of Native American cultural places, including prehistoric, archaeological, cultural, spiritual, and ceremonial sites on both public and private lands, throughout all stages of the planning and development process.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System utilizes a number of strategies to identify, map, and evaluate cultural resources within the archaeological and historic built APEs. See Section 3.17.5.2 for a more detailed discussion of resource identification.</p> <p>The California HSR System provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of archaeological and historic built resources in the MOA and applicable treatment plan.</p>
<p>Policy CO-5.3.1: For any proposed Area Plan Amendment, Specific Plan, or Specific Plan Amendment, notify and consult with any California Native American tribes on the contact list maintained by the California Native American Heritage Commission that have traditional lands within the County's jurisdiction, regarding any potential impacts on Native American resources from the proposed action, pursuant to State guidelines.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Authority has actively engaged tribal governments on behalf of the project. See Section 3.17.4.2 for a more detailed discussion of coordination efforts.</p> <p>The California HSR System features IAMFs that would prepare a pre-construction sensitivity map, surveys, an archaeological monitoring plan, and pre-construction conditions assessments to identify and preserve cultural resources. Mitigation measures proposed for the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would lessen impacts on cultural resources where feasible. See CUL-MM#2 and CUL-MM#4 for the detailed protocols delineating the preservation of cultural resources.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Policy CO-5.3.2: For any proposed development project that may have a potential impact on Native American cultural resources, provide notification to California Native American tribes on the contact list maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission that have traditional lands within the County's jurisdiction, and consider the input received prior to a discretionary decision.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Authority has actively engaged tribal governments on behalf of the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section. See Section 3.17.4.2 for a more detailed discussion of coordination efforts.</p> <p>The California HSR System features IAMFs that would prepare a pre-construction sensitivity map, surveys, an archaeological monitoring plan, and pre-construction conditions assessments to preserve cultural resources. Mitigation measures proposed for the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would lessen impacts on resources where feasible. See CUL-IAMF#5, CUL-MM#2, and CUL-MM#4 for the detailed protocols delineating protection of cultural resources.</p>
<p>Policy CO-5.3.3: Review and consider a cultural resources study for any new grading or development in areas identified as having a high potential for Native American resources, and incorporate recommendations into the project approval as appropriate to mitigate impacts on cultural resources.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System implements various measures to preserve historic built and archaeological resources within the archaeological and historic built APEs. Appropriate mitigation is provided where feasible.</p>
Sylmar Community Plan (1997)	
<p>Policy LU3.1: Preserve existing historic resources, significant vegetation, trees, and other natural features which contribute to the overall charm and rural character of the area. Encourage the rehabilitation and rebuilding of deteriorated housing as a means of preserving Sylmar's character.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System utilizes a variety of efforts to identify and preserve cultural resources located within the archaeological and historic built APEs. CUL-IAMF#5, CUL-IAMF#6, CUL-MM#2, and CUL-MM#4 describe the various protocols implemented in order to mitigate adverse effects on historic resources.</p>
<p>LU15.2: Preserve historic structures and older buildings that add to the character of the existing traditional low-scale commercial corridor development along Foothill Boulevard.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System utilizes a variety of efforts to identify and preserve cultural resources located within the archaeological and historic built APEs. CUL-IAMF#5, CUL-IAMF#6, CUL-MM#2, and CUL-MM#4 describe the various protocols implemented in order to mitigate adverse effects on historic built resources.</p>
<p>Goal LU24: A community with distinct and historically significant character which values and preserves its historic resources and cultural amenities for future generations to enjoy.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System utilizes a variety of efforts to identify and preserve cultural resources located within the archaeological and historic built APEs. CUL-IAMF#5, CUL-IAMF#6, CUL-MM#2, and CUL-MM#4 describe the various protocols implemented in order to mitigate adverse effects on archaeological and historic built resources.</p>
<p>LU24.1: Protect, preserve, and enhance identified cultural and historical resources.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of archaeological and historic built resources in the MOA and applicable treatment plans.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>LU24.5: Promote the restoration and reuse of existing buildings as a key component of the City's sustainability policies.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of archaeological and historic built resources in the MOA and applicable treatment plan.</p>
Sun Valley-La Tuña Canyon Community Plan (1999)	
<p>Objective 1-4: To preserve and enhance neighborhoods with a distinctive and significant historical character.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of historic built resources in the MOA and applicable treatment plan.</p>
<p>Policy 1-4.1: Protect and encourage reuse of the area's historic resources.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of archaeological and historic built resources in the MOA and applicable treatment plans.</p>
<p>Goal 17: Preservation and restoration of cultural resources, neighborhoods, and landmarks which have historical and/or cultural significance.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of archaeological and historic built resources in the MOA and applicable treatment plans.</p>
<p>Objective 17-1: To ensure that the community's historically significant resources are protected, preserved, and/or enhanced.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of archaeological and historic built resources in the MOA and applicable treatment plans.</p>
<p>Policy 17-1.1: Encourage the preservation, maintenance, enhancement, and reuse of existing historically significant buildings and the restoration of original facades</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of historic built resources in the MOA and applicable PA.</p>
Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace-Shadow Hills-East La Tuña Canyon Community Plan (1997)	
<p>Objective 1-4: To preserve and enhance structures that have a distinctive and significant historical character.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System utilizes a variety of efforts to identify and preserve cultural resources located within the archaeological and historic built APES. See CUL-IAMF#5, CUL-IAMF#6, CUL-MM#2, and CUL-MM#4 for a detailed description of protocols.</p>
<p>Policy 1-4.1: Protect and encourage reuse of the area's historic resources.</p>	<p>Consistent: The California HSR System provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of archaeological and historic built resources in the MOA and applicable treatment plans.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Historic and Cultural Resources, Goal 16: Preservation and restoration of cultural resources, neighborhoods, and landmarks which have historical and/or cultural significance.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System utilizes a variety of efforts to identify and preserve cultural resources located within the archaeological and historic built APEs. CUL-IAMF#5, CUL-IAMF#6, CUL-MM#2, and CUL-MM#4 describe the various protocols implemented in order to mitigate adverse effects on archaeological and historic built resources.</p>
<p>Objective 16-1: To ensure that the community's historically significant resources are protected, preserved, and/or enhanced.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of archaeological and historic built resources in the MOA and applicable treatment plans.</p>
<p>Policy 16.-1.1: Encourage the preservation, maintenance, enhancement, and reuse of existing historically significant buildings and the restoration of original facades.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of archaeological and historic built resources in the MOA and applicable treatment plans.</p>
<p>Los Angeles Municipal Code (2016)</p>	
<p>City of Los Angeles Municipal Code assures the restoration, protection, and rehabilitation of the properties, monuments, or elements that are of cultural, historical, or architectural value.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System provides IAMFs and mitigation measures to preserve cultural resources to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the project would comply with the stipulations regarding the treatment of archaeological and historic built resources in the MOA and applicable treatment plans.</p>
<p>Section 3.18 Regional Growth</p>	
<p>Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 (2015)</p>	
<p>Policy M 4.3: Maintain transit services within the unincorporated areas that are affordable, timely, cost-effective, and responsive to growth patterns and community input.</p>	<p>Consistent. The Palmdale to Burbank Project Section would not remove any existing transit services and would improve mobility and accessibility.</p>
<p>Policy LU 3.3: Discourage development in undeveloped areas where infrastructure and public services do not exist, or where no major infrastructure projects are planned, such as state and/or federal highways.</p>	<p>Consistent. Station areas would be located within previously developed areas in Palmdale and Burbank, where infrastructure and public services exist.</p>
<p>Policy LU 4.1: Encourage infill development in urban and suburban areas on vacant, underutilized, and/or brownfield sites.</p>	<p>Consistent. HSR stations in Palmdale and Burbank would function as multimodal transportation hubs and would be designed as pedestrian friendly environments that encourage first/last mile connectivity. Therefore, these areas would help achieve adopted goals related to transit-oriented development and infill development.</p>
<p>Policy LU 4.3: Encourage transit-oriented development in urban and suburban areas with the appropriate residential density along transit corridors and within station areas.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System project proposes an HSR system with stations that would function as multimodal transportation hubs. Such areas would help achieve adopted goals related to transit-oriented development and infill development.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Policy LU 6.1: Protect rural communities from the encroachment of incompatible development that conflicts with existing land use patterns and service standards.</p>	<p>Consistent. Development associated with station areas would be located in previously developed areas in Palmdale and Burbank.</p>
<p>City of Lancaster General Plan 2030 (2009)</p>	
<p>Goal 7: To preserve existing housing stock within areas for which a desirable living environment can be provided; to promote conversion of such residential areas for which a desirable living environment cannot be sustained.</p>	<p>Inconsistent for all six Build Alternatives. The California HSR System would require the demolition of existing housing in Lancaster. While sufficient replacement housing units are available in the surrounding area to accommodate the relocation of the residents displaced by the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section, the California HSR System would result in the loss of housing stock in the city.</p>
<p>City of Palmdale General Plan (1993)</p>	
<p>Goal L1: Create a vision for long-term growth and development in the city of Palmdale, which provides for orderly, functional patterns of land uses within urban areas, a unified and coherent urban form, and a high quality of life for its residents.</p>	<p>Consistent. The California HSR System would result in long-term economic growth for the region. The California HSR System may attract new businesses to the station area by improving regional transportation access in the Palmdale area. Therefore, the Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.</p>
<p>Policy L1.1.2: Provide incentives to promote infill development, in order to foster more cohesive neighborhoods, maximize use of infrastructure, consolidate development patterns and enhance community appearance.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project includes an HSR system that would improve mobility and accessibility. HSR stations would function as pedestrian-friendly, multimodal transportation hubs and would encourage first/last mile connectivity. Such areas would help achieve adopted goals related to transit-oriented development and infill development. Therefore, the Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.</p>
<p>Objective L2.3: Revitalize the core area of Palmdale so as to maintain and enhance its economic viability.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project includes an HSR system that would improve mobility and accessibility. The project would help the City of Palmdale to achieve its adopted infill development and transit-oriented development planning goals near the Palmdale Station site, which could promote revitalization of the core area of Palmdale. Therefore, the Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.</p>
<p>Policy L2.3.1(5): Promote establishment of a transportation facility within the downtown area, serving as a hub for rail, bus, and other public transportation systems.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project includes HSR and associated multimodal linkages. The Palmdale Station would be a multimodal hub that would promote other types of public transit in addition to HSR. Therefore, the Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.</p>
<p>Palmdale Transit Village Specific Plan (2007)</p>	
<p>Goal L1: Create a vision for long-term growth and development in the city of Palmdale which provides for orderly, functional patterns of land uses within urban areas, a unified and coherent urban form, and a high quality of life for its residents.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project includes an HSR system that would improve mobility and accessibility. The project would help the City of Palmdale to achieve its adopted infill development and transit-oriented development planning goals near the Palmdale Station site. Therefore, the Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Goal L2: Adopt land use and development policies which encourage growth and diversification of the city's economic base.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project includes an HSR system that would improve mobility and accessibility. The California HSR System may attract new businesses to the station area and Palmdale area by improving regional transportation access. Therefore, the Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.</p>
Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace-Shadow Hills-East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan (1997)	
<p>Policy 1-1.4: The City should promote neighborhood preservation in existing residential neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. Project features would preserve neighborhoods by using existing roads and previously developed areas wherever possible. The Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives would not divide any neighborhoods in this planning area because the alignment would not travel at grade through residential areas. Therefore, these alternatives would be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Inconsistent for the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives. Wherever possible, project features would use existing roads and previously developed areas, thereby minimizing incompatible land uses. However, the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives would cross through residential neighborhoods (Lake View Terrace and Shadow Hills) and convert existing residential uses to transportation use to accommodate construction staging, rail alignment, utility easement, and access. Therefore, the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives would be inconsistent with this goal.</p>
Sylmar Community Plan (1997)	
<p>Policy 1-1.2: Protect existing single-family residential neighborhoods from encroachment by higher density residential and other incompatible uses.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. Because development would likely be concentrated in the Burbank Airport Station area, a previously developed area of Burbank, single-family residential neighborhoods in Sylmar would not be expected to be affected by the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. Therefore, the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>The E2 and E2A Build Alternatives would not traverse the plan area.</p>
Arleta-Pacoima Community Plan (1996)	
<p>Protect single-family character of neighborhoods. Preserve and enhance the positive characteristics of the existing residential neighborhoods while providing a variety of housing opportunities with compatible new housing.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. New tracks and construction staging areas would be located within this plan area; however, no development associated with the Burbank Airport Station would likely be located in this plan area. Therefore, the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>The E2 and E2A Build Alternatives would not traverse the plan area.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon Community Plan (1999)	
<p>Policy 1-1.2: Protect existing single-family residential neighborhoods from encroachment by higher density residential and other incompatible uses.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. For the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives, new tracks and construction staging areas would be located within this plan area. There would be no new at grade tracks within residential neighborhoods in the plan area. The project within the plan area would be mostly within industrial areas near San Fernando Road. Additionally, these build alternatives would use the existing rail corridor, thus development within the plan area would not require conversion of existing residential areas. Therefore, existing single-family residential neighborhoods would be protected from encroachment by transportation uses.</p> <p>Consistent for the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives. The E2 and E2A Build Alternatives would be built in a tunnel within this plan area. In some areas, the tunnel would be built via cut and cover; however, this would be limited to industrial and commercial areas. Thus, potentially incompatible transportation uses within the Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon Community Plan Area would not encroach upon low-density residential neighborhoods, nor would it require conversion of existing residential areas into transportation land uses.</p>
Burbank 2035 General Plan (2013)	
<p>Policy M 1.1: Consider economic growth, transportation demands, and neighborhood character in developing a comprehensive transportation system that meets Burbank’s needs.</p>	<p>Consistent: The HSR Build Alternatives would improve mobility and accessibility and create economic opportunities for Burbank with the implementation of the Burbank Airport Station.</p>
Chapter 5 Environmental Justice	
City of Palmdale General Plan (City of Palmdale 1993)	
<p>Policy L1.1.2: Provide incentives to promote infill development in order to foster more cohesive neighborhoods, maximize use of infrastructure, consolidate development patterns, and enhance community appearance.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project would improve mobility and accessibility. Such development would provide an opportunity for transit-oriented development planning and infill development near station areas.</p>
<p>Policy C2.2.6: Establish a regional transportation center within the city, conveniently located to maximize access to downtown and major commercial centers, which will accommodate a variety of public transportation uses including rail, bus, and shuttle service.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project would include a station in Palmdale as part of a Build Alternative that would provide connections to other surface transit services in the area.</p>
City of Palmdale General Plan – Housing Update (2021)	
<p>Goal H2: Preserve and Improve the Existing Supply of Affordable Housing</p>	<p>Consistent. The project would displace existing housing in Palmdale. However, sufficient replacement housing sites are available in the surrounding area to accommodate the relocation of the residents displaced by the Palmdale to Burbank Project Section.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
City of Burbank 2035 General Plan (City of Burbank 2013)	
Policy LU 1.3: Maintain and protect Burbank's residential neighborhoods by avoiding encroachment of incompatible land uses and public facilities.	Consistent. Project-related improvements within the Burbank Subsection would be limited to areas near existing industrial areas or rights-of-way.
Policy 4.5: Require that pedestrian-oriented areas include amenities such as sidewalks of adequate width, benches, street trees and landscaping, decorative paving, public art, kiosks, and restrooms.	Consistent. Generally, all pedestrian-oriented areas would be configured and designed to include wide sidewalks, street furniture; street trees; landscaping; decorative materials; and direct access to kiosks, restrooms, and station entrances. These amenities would be provided to create a safe, shaded, enjoyable walking experience for station users.
Los Angeles County General Plan (October 2015)	
Policy LU 6.1: Protect rural communities from the encroachment of incompatible development that conflicts with existing land-use patterns and service standards.	Consistent. Most of the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, E1A, E2, and E2A Build Alternative alignments within rural areas would be within tunnels. Within rural areas, aboveground portions of the project such as access roads would generally follow existing corridors. The presence of the Build Alternatives would be unlikely to induce substantial growth or intensify land uses within rural areas where there is no interface or access point to the HSR system. Therefore, the project would not encourage inconsistent land development in rural communities. See Section 3.18, Regional Growth, for further detail.
Goal M4: An efficient multimodal transportation system that serves the needs of all residents.	Consistent. The project would provide one component of a multimodal circulation system including local roadways, freeways, bicycle lanes, and bus and rail, to address transportation needs of the project area.
Policy M4.9: Ensure the participation of all potentially affected communities in the transportation planning and decision-making process.	Consistent. The planning and environmental processes for the HSR project have provided, and will continue to provide, extensive opportunities for members and representatives of affected communities to participate in the planning, evaluation, and decision-making processes for this project. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy M 4.10: Support the linkage of regional and community-level transportation systems, including multimodal networks.	Consistent. The project would substantially expand the regional transit system and continue to coordinate multimodal linkages with existing public transit service infrastructure and services for increased accessibility.
Los Angeles County Antelope Valley Area Plan (2015)	
Policy M 6.7: Establish a regional transportation hub in Palmdale with feeder transit service to the rural areas of the unincorporated Antelope Valley.	Consistent. The project includes high-speed rail and associated multimodal linkages. The Authority continues to coordinate with other transit agencies to connect Antelope Valley to the HSR system through these multimodal linkages.

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
<p>Policy M 6.8: In planning for all regional transportation systems, consider and mitigate potential impacts on existing communities, and minimize land-use conflicts.</p>	<p>Consistent. Potential environmental impacts of the project that are under the purview of NEPA and CEQA are analyzed within this Draft EIR/EIS document. Mitigation measures are proposed for significant impacts. Additionally, the project has incorporated IAMFs into its design.</p>
<p>City of Los Angeles Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles (2015)</p>	
<p>Policy 1.7 – Displacement and Health: Reduce the harmful health impacts of displacement on individuals, families, and communities by pursuing strategies to create opportunities for existing residents to benefit from local revitalization efforts by: creating local employment and economic opportunities for low-income residents and local small businesses; expanding and preserving existing housing opportunities available to low-income residents; preserving cultural and social resources; and creating and implementing tools to evaluate and mitigate the potential displacement caused by large-scale investment and development</p>	<p>Inconsistent for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. In the long term, the areas around the Palmdale and Burbank Stations would likely be revitalized, bringing economic benefits to their communities. In the short term, the project would result in a substantial number of residential and nonresidential displacements, (including displacement of environmental justice populations). In Sun Valley, insufficient availability of replacement units to accommodate all displaced residents was identified.</p> <p>Inconsistent for the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives. In addition to Sun Valley, Lake View Terrace would also have insufficient replacement units available to accommodate all displaced residents for the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives.</p>
<p>Policy 5.1 – Air pollution and respiratory health: Reduce air pollution from stationary and mobile sources; protect human health and welfare and promote improved respiratory health.</p>	<p>Consistent. The project would provide efficient movement of people, which would reduce total VMT, thus reducing air pollutants.</p>
<p>Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace-Shadow Hills-East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan (1997) (Part of City of Los Angeles General Plan)</p>	
<p>Policy 1-1.4 The City should promote neighborhood preservation in existing residential neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. Palmdale to Burbank Project Section features would preserve neighborhoods by utilizing existing roads and previously developed areas wherever possible. Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A would not divide neighborhoods because the alignment would not be at grade through residential areas.</p> <p>Inconsistent for the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives. Wherever possible, E2 and E2A Build Alternative features would use existing roads and previously developed areas, thereby minimizing the encroachment of incompatible land uses. However, the project would displace existing residential development within neighborhoods (Lake View Terrace and Shadow Hills) to accommodate construction staging, rail alignment, utility easement, access road, and drainage.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Sylmar Community Plan (1997)	
<p>Policy 1-1.2: Protect existing single-family residential neighborhoods from encroachment by higher-density residential and other incompatible uses.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. Single-family residential neighborhoods would not be impacted by the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, or E1A Build Alternatives, which would follow the same alignment near the community of Sylmar. Several temporary construction staging areas would be located northeast of Sylmar. Additionally, a utility easement would travel within the existing roadway within a single-family neighborhood. Development within the Sylmar Community Plan area would not require conversion of existing residential areas.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E2 and E2A Build Alternative. No portion of the E2 and E2A alignment would cross this plan area.</p>
<p>Policy 1-1.7: Maintain the community plan's land uses designated for residential as single-family residential uses.</p>	
<p>Policy 1-1.8: The city should promote neighborhood preservation, particularly in existing single-family neighborhoods, as well as in areas with existing multiple-family residences.</p>	
Arleta-Pacoima Community Plan (1996) (Part of City of Los Angeles General Plan)	
<p>Protect single-family character of neighborhoods. Preserve and enhance the positive characteristics of the existing residential neighborhoods while providing a variety of housing opportunities with compatible new housing.</p>	<p>Consistent for the Refined SR14, SR14A, E1, and E1A Build Alternatives. New tracks and temporary construction staging areas would be located within this plan area. The aboveground Build Alternative features within the plan area would be within industrial areas near Interstate 210 and near San Fernando Road. Construction activities and implementation of utility infrastructure may occur near residential areas; however, such features would be located within existing infrastructure and would therefore not change the character of the community. Thus, the project within the plan area would not require conversion of existing residential areas into incompatible land use designations.</p> <p>Not Applicable for the E2 and E2A Build Alternative. No portion of the E2 and E2A alignment would cross this plan area.</p>

Goals, Policies, and Objectives	Consistency Determination
Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon Community Plan (1999) (Part of City of Los Angeles General Plan)	
<p>Policy 1-1.2 Protect existing single-family residential neighborhoods from encroachment by higher density residential and other incompatible uses.</p>	<p>Consistent. New Refined SR14, SR14A, E1 and E1A tracks and construction staging areas would be located within this plan area. There would be no new at-grade tracks within residential neighborhoods in the plan area. The project within the plan area would be mostly within industrial areas near San Fernando Road. The Refined SR14, SR14A, E1 and E1A Build Alternatives would each encounter a residential area located near the Sun Valley Metrolink Station, but the alignment would be contained within the existing rail corridor in this area. Thus project-related improvements within the plan area would not require the conversion of existing residential areas into incompatible land use designations.</p> <p>The E2 and E2A Build Alternatives would be constructed and contained within a tunnel under residential areas within this plan area. In areas of industrial and commercial uses, cut-and-cover construction may be utilized. Thus, construction of the E2 and E2A Build Alternatives would not encroach upon low density residential areas, nor would it require conversion of existing residential areas into incompatible land use designations.</p>

Source: City of Burbank, 2001, 2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2011, 2013, 2019; City of Lancaster, 2009 2010, 2013, 2015, 2019a, 2019b; City of Los Angeles, 1973, 1996a, 1996b, 1997a, 1997b, 1999, 2001, 2004, 2007, 2010, 2015, 2018, 2019; City of Palmdale, 1992, 1993, 1998, 2007, 2011, 2012a, 2012b, 2015, 2017, 2019; City of Santa Clarita, 2009, 2011, 2015, 2019; Los Angeles County, 2004, 2012a, 2012b, 2014, 2015a, 2015b, 2016, 2019a, 2019b; SCAG, 2008, 2016, 202.; USFS 2005a, 2005b.

AVAQMD = Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District; GHG = greenhouse gas; HSR = high-speed rail; IAMF = impact avoidance and minimization feature; mph = miles per hour; MTCO2e = metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent; ROG = reactive organic gas; SB = Senate Bill; SCAG = Southern California Association of Governments; SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District; TOD = transit-oriented development; VMT = vehicle miles traveled; VOC = volatile organic compound; ANF = Angeles National Forest; MM = Mitigation Measure; SCREMP = Santa Clara River Enhancement Plan; SEA = significant ecological area; USFS = U.S. Forest Service; USFWS = U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; C.F.R. = Code of Federal Regulations; FEMA = Federal Emergency Management Agency; FPP = flood protection; plan; LID = low-impact development; SGMNM = San Gabriel Mountains National Monument; SWPPP = stormwater pollution prevention plan; USEO = United States Presidential Executive Order; APE = area of potential effect; DPR = (California) Department of Parks and Recreation; GIS = geographic information system; MOA = Memorandum of Agreement; OHP = (California) Office of Historic Preservation; PA = Programmatic Agreement; N/A = not applicable; State = State of California; SPCC = spill protection, control, and countermeasure; dBA = a-weighted decibels; RSA = resource study area; Metro = Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority; FAR = Federal Air Regulations; RPZ = runway protection zone; TOD = transit-oriented development; PCT = Pacific Crest Trail, KVP = key viewpoint, SR = State Route

1 REFERENCES

- City of Burbank. 2001. *Consolidated Contingency Plan*. January 2001. www.burbankfire.us/home/showdocument?id=183 (accessed August 2019)
- _____. 2008. *Sustainability Action Plan*.
- _____. 2009a. *Bicycle Master Plan*.
<https://www.burbankca.gov/documents/173607/240347/20210204-Bicycle-Master-Plan-001.pdf/53be8720-2d59-19ad-bd4a-168ac74d7d22?t=1612567201263>. December 2009.
- _____. 2009b. *City of Burbank Multi-Hazard Functional Plan*. December 15, 2009.
http://burbank.granicus.com/Viewer.php?view_id=6&clip_id=844&meta_id=61956. (accessed November 2020).
- _____. 2011. *All-Hazard Mitigation Plan*. April 2011. www.burbankfire.us/divisions/emergency-management/hazard-mitigation-plan-2011 (accessed November 2020).
- _____. 2013. *Burbank 2035 General Plan*.
<https://www.burbankca.gov/documents/173607/0/Burbank2035+General+Plan.pdf/139656b0-80e9-3b11-dc6d-751642c85b38?t=1612301807431>. February 19, 2013.
- _____. 2019. *Municipal Code*. Amended November 15, 2019.
- City of Lancaster. 2009. *General Plan 2030*.
<https://www.cityoflanasterca.org/home/showpublisheddocument/9323/635775792210230000>. City of Lancaster Planning Department. July 14, 2009.
- _____. 2010. *City of Lancaster Emergency Operations Plan*.
<https://www.cityoflanasterca.org/home/showdocument?id=13457>.
- _____. 2013 *City of Lancaster Hazard Mitigation Plan*. September 23, 2013.
www.cityoflanasterca.org/home/showdocument?id=21798. (accessed August 2019).
- _____. 2015. *Sustainable City Plan*.
- _____. 2019a. *Municipal Code*. Amended June 2019.
- _____. 2019b. *Climate Action Plan*. <https://www.cityoflanasterpa.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/City-of-Lanasters-Municipal-Operations-Climate-Action-Plan-low-res.pdf>. September 2019.
- City of Los Angeles. 1973. *City of Los Angeles General Plan: Open Space Element*.
https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/01ea5f66-3281-488a-930b-f523712fef07/Open_Space_Element.pdf. June 1973.
- _____. 1996a. *Arleta-Pacoima Community Plan*. https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/7de7c06e-77cb-4283-addf-8d98b5533674/Arleta-Pacoima_Community_Plan.pdf. November 1996.
- _____. 1996b. *City of Los Angeles General Plan: Safety Element*.
https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/31b07c9a-7eea-4694-9899-f00265b2dc0d/Safety_Element.pdf. November 26, 1996.
- _____. 1997a. *Sylmar Community Plan*. https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/135cc3ac-0e43-4338-a968-c5b44fa41bb3/Sylmar_Community_Plan.pdf. June 2017.
- _____. 1997b. *Sunland - Tujunga - Lake View Terrace - Shadow Hills - East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan*. https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/b4307861-43a8-4bff-8221-3f4c4eab86a4/Sunland-Tujunga-Shadow_Hills-Lake_View_Terrace-East_La_Tuna_Canyon_Community_Plan.pdf. November 18, 1997.
- _____. 1999. *Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon Community Plan*.
https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/150fec66-d790-44ad-96cd-062484ac90d0/Sun_Valley-La_Tuna_Canyon_Community_Plan.pdf. August 13, 1999.

- _____. 2001. *City of Los Angeles General Plan: Conservation Element*. https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/28af7e21-ffdd-4f26-84e6-dfa967b2a1ee/Conservation_Element.pdf. September 26, 2001.
- _____. 2004. *San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Specific Plan*. February 8, 2004. http://planning.lacity.org/complan/specplan/pdf/SanGab_Verdugo.pdf. (accessed February 2017).
- _____. 2007. *Green LA: An Action Plan to Lead the Nation in Fighting Global Warming*. https://planning.lacity.org/eir/8150Sunset/References/4.E.%20Greenhouse%20Gas%20missions/GHG.26_City%20LA%20GreenLA%20ActionPlan.pdf. May 2007.
- _____. 2010. *City of Los Angeles General Plan*. <https://planning.lacity.org/cwd/framwk/contents.htm>
- _____. 2015. *Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles – A Health and Wellness Element of the General Plan*. https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/7f065983-ff10-4e76-81e5-e166c9b78a9e/Plan_for_a_Healthy_Los_Angeles.pdf. March 2015.
- _____. 2018. *City of Los Angeles Emergency Operations Plan*. https://emergency.lacity.org/sites/g/files/wph1791/files/2021-04/comprehensive_emergency_operations_plan_eop-2018.pdf. November 2018.
- _____. 2019. *Municipal Code*. Amended June 2019.
- City of Palmdale. 1992. *Specific Plan: Plant 10 Palmdale Lockheed Advanced Development Company*. <https://cityofpalmdale.org/DocumentCenter/View/615/Lockheed-Plant-10-PDF>. September 10, 1992.
- _____. 1993. *Palmdale General Plan*. <https://cityofpalmdale.org/279/General-Plan>. January 25, 1993.
- _____. 1998. *City of Palmdale Avenue S Corridor Area Plan*. June 10, 1998.
- _____. 2007. *Palmdale Transit Village Specific Plan*. <https://cityofpalmdale.org/DocumentCenter/View/606/Palmdale-Transit-Village-Addendum-PDF>. April 2007.
- _____. 2011. *City of Palmdale Energy Action Plan*. <https://cityofpalmdale.org/DocumentCenter/View/195/Palmdale-Energy-Action-Plan-PEAP-PDF>. August 3, 2011.
- _____. 2012. *Emergency Operations Plan*. February 29, 2012. www.cityofpalmdale.org/Portals/0/Documents/Residents/COP%20EOP%20Executive%20Summary.pdf. (accessed August 2019).
- _____. 2015. *Local Hazard Mitigation Plan*. April 1, 2015. www.cityofpalmdale.org/Portals/0/Events/LHMP2015.pdf. (accessed August 2019).
- _____. 2017. *Palmdale Trade and Commerce Center Specific Plan*. <https://www.cityofpalmdale.org/DocumentCenter/View/605/Palmdale-Trade-and-Commerce-Center-PDF>. July 11, 2017.
- _____. 2019. *Palmdale Municipal Code*. Amended August 6, 2019.
- _____. 2021. *City of Palmdale General Plan: Draft 2021 – 2029 Housing Element*. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5c7dc93065a707492aca3e47/t/6149096177aba05e42108047/1632176488568/Palmdale+DRAFT+HE+2021-2029_submittedtoHCD.pdf. September 3, 2021.
- City of Santa Clarita. 2009. *City of Santa Clarita Community Character and Design Guidelines*. March 24, 2009.
- _____. 2011. *City of Santa Clarita General Plan*. June 2011.

- _____. 2015. *City of Santa Clarita Local Hazard Mitigation Plan*. September 15, 2015. <http://filecenter.santa-clarita.com/EmergencyMgmt/2015%20Hazard%20Mitigation%20Plan-Final%20Draft.pdf>. (accessed August 2019).
- _____. 2019. *Santa Clarita Municipal Code*. Amended August 27, 2019.
- Los Angeles County. 2004. *Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan*. Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, Airport Land Use Commission. https://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/data/pd_alup.pdf. Updated December 1, 2004.
- _____. 2012a. *Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan*. Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning. https://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/ovov_2012-fulldoc.pdf. November 27, 2012.
- _____. 2012b. *Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan Update – One Valley, One Vision*. Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning. November 27, 2012. <http://planning.lacounty.gov/ovov>. (accessed November 2016).
- _____. 2014. *Los Angeles County Strategic Plan for Emergency Management*. <https://beaches.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/StrategicPlan.pdf>. June 2014.
- _____. 2015a. *Antelope Valley Area Plan*. Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning. https://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/tnc_draft-20150601.pdf. June 16, 2015.
- _____. 2015b. *Los Angeles County General Plan 2035*. Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning. <https://planning.lacounty.gov/generalplan>. October 6, 2015.
- _____. 2016. *Code of Ordinances*. Amended December 2016.
- _____. 2019a. *All-Hazard Mitigation Plan*. http://file.lacounty.gov/SDSInter/lac/1062614_AHMPPublicDraft_Oct1.pdf. (accessed March 2020).
- _____. 2019b. *Los Angeles County Zoning Code*. Amended November 8, 2019.
- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 2008. *Final 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan*. October 2, 2008. www.scag.ca.gov/Documents/f2008RCP_Complete.pdf (accessed August 2019).
- _____. 2016. *2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy – A Plan for Mobility, Accessibility, Sustainability and a High Quality of Life*. <http://scagrtpscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS.pdf>. (accessed October 2017).
- _____. 2020. *Final 2020–2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy: Connect SoCal*. September 2020. https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/0903fconnectsocial-plan_0.pdf?1606001176. (accessed November 2020).
- United States Forest Service (USFS). 2005a. *USDA Land Management Plan for the Pacific Southwest Region Part 1: Southern California National Forests Vision*. September 2005. www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5166876.pdf (accessed October 2016).
- _____. 2005b. *USDA Land Management Plan for the Pacific Southwest Region Part 2: Angeles National Forest Strategy*. September 2005. www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5166877.pdf (accessed October 2016).