County of Los Angeles
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE
713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
http://ceo.lacounty.gov

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

October 2, 2007

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Supervisors:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS: NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR PERMANENT CLOSURE TO THROUGH TRAFFIC ON CONESTOGA DRIVE EAST OF 45TH STREET WEST IN THE UNINCORPORATED COUNTY AREA OF LANCASTER (SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT 5) (3 VOTES)

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Consider the Negative Declaration for this project, find on the basis of the whole record before your Board that there is not substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment, find that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of your Board, adopt the Negative Declaration, and authorize the Director of Public Works to file a Notice of Determination in accordance with Section 21152(a) of the California Public Resources Code and pay the required filing and processing fees with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk in the amount of $1,850.

2. Adopt the resolution to permanently close Conestoga Drive to through traffic at its intersection with 45th Street West pursuant to provisions of Section 21101(f) of the California Vehicle Code.

3. Authorize the construction of roadway improvements to effect the closure.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

The purpose of the recommended actions is to alleviate potential traffic concerns on Conestoga Drive east of 45th Street West that may result from additional traffic generated by the new Endeavour Middle School.

Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals

The Countywide Strategic Plan directs that we provide Service Excellence (Goal 1) and Community Services (Goal 6) by enhancing the quality of life for residents in these areas once the road closure is in place.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

There will be no impact to the County General Fund. The design and construction cost associated with the proposed road closure is being financed and managed by the residents of this community.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

Property owners within the Casa Grande Homeowners Association, which is made up of approximately 28 properties between Conestoga Drive to the north, Avenue K to the south, 45th Street West to the west, and 42nd Street West to the east, have requested the closure of Conestoga Drive at 45th Street West. They are concerned that traffic from the new Endeavour Middle School will use Conestoga Drive as a cut-through route.

California Vehicle Code Section 21101(f) allows a local authority to permanently close to through traffic a highway under its jurisdiction when it finds that the closure is necessary to implement the circulation element of the local jurisdiction's general plan provided that the closure is consistent with the provision for the health and safety of the citizenry. Conestoga Drive is a local street and is not identified in the County's Highway Plan. Therefore, it is not subject to policies contained in the Circulation element of the County General Plan. The Sheriff's Department and the California Highway Patrol have given support to the permanent closure attesting to its effectiveness in improving traffic safety, and they have no objection to the closure with regard to the provision of law enforcement services. The Fire Department has no objection to the permanent closure as long as a means of emergency-only access is provided. Accordingly, the work to be carried out by the impacted homeowners' representative will include a gate that can only be opened by emergency service providers.

The attached resolution has been approved as to form by County Counsel.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

An Initial Study was prepared for the project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, a Negative Declaration was prepared. A public notice was published in the *Antelope Valley Press* on July 6, 2007, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21092.

The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of the proceedings upon which your Board's decision is based in this matter is the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Programs Development Division, 900 South Fremont Avenue, 11th Floor, Alhambra, California 91803. The custodian of such documents and materials is Mr. Ed Dingman, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works.

The project is not exempt from payment of a fee to the California Department of Fish and Game pursuant to Section 711.4 of the Fish and Game Code to defray the costs of fish and wildlife protection and management incurred by the California Department of Fish and Game. Upon your Board's adoption of the Negative Declaration, the Department of Public Works will file a Notice of Determination in accordance with Section 21152(a) of the California Public Resources Code and pay the required filing and processing fees with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk in the amount of $1,850.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

The closure of Conestoga Drive east of its intersection with 45th Street West will alleviate potential traffic safety concerns, as a result of additional traffic generated by the new Endeavour Middle School.

CONCLUSION

Please return one copy of this letter and adopted resolution to the Department of Public Works, Traffic and Lighting Division.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

WTF:DLW
WJW:kw

Attachments (2)

c: County Counsel
Department of Public Works (Programs Development)

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ORDERING THE PERMANENT CLOSURE OF CONESTOGA DRIVE EAST OF 45TH STREET WEST TO THROUGH TRAFFIC IN THE UNINCORPORATED COUNTY AREA OF LANCASTER

WHEREAS, the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors is empowered, pursuant to Section 21101(f) of the California Vehicle Code to permanently close to through traffic a highway under its jurisdiction in accordance with, or not conflicting with, the Circulation Element of the County of Los Angeles General Plan, and to do so in the interest of public safety;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that Conestoga Drive shall be permanently closed to through traffic at the west line of its intersection with 45th Street West by construction of permanent roadway improvements including a concrete masonry wall and steel gates, signs, and markings as determined by the Director of Public Works.

The foregoing resolution was on the _____day of _____, 2007, adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles.

SACHI A. HAMAI
Executive Officer of the
Board of Supervisors of the
County of Los Angeles

By_____
Deputy

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

RAYMOND G. FORTNER, JR.
County Counsel

By_____
Deputy

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

NEGATIVE DECLARATION
FOR
CONESTOGA DRIVE AT 45TH STREET WEST

I. Locations and Brief Description

The proposed project is located in the unincorporated area of the County of Los Angeles territory south of the City of Lancaster. The project consists of the construction of a permanent barrier across Conestoga Drive east of the intersection of 45th Street West.

The proposed project involves the construction of bulb-shaped cul-de-sac at the west end of the roadway of Conestoga Drive at 45th Street West, a combination concrete masonry wall and steel picket fencing between the Conestoga Drive cul-de-sac and 45th Street West, and steel picket gates across Conestoga Drive adjoining the wall and fence. In case of emergency, keys for the locked gates will be provided to emergency service providers.

II. Mitigation Measures Include in the Project to Avoid Potentially Significant Effects

No significant effects are identified.

III. Finding of No Significant Effect

Based on the attached Initial Study, it has been determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

Attach.
P:\tlpub\INVEST\INV\Conestoga Dr @ 45th St W Neg Dec full.doc

INITIAL STUDY OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

1. **Project Title**: Conestoga Drive at 45th Street West.

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address**: County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, 11th Floor, Programs Development Division, 900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, California 91803-1331.

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number**: Mr. Albert E. Anidi, (626) 458-5199.

4. **Project Location**: County of Los Angeles unincorporated area south of the City of Lancaster.

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address**: Casagrande Estates Homeowners Association, c/o Gary Little, 4325 Conestoga Drive, Lancaster, California 93536.

6. **General Plan Designation**: County of Los Angeles.

7. **Zoning**: Adjacent parcels are zoned light agricultural.

8. **Description of Project**: The purpose of the proposed project consists of constructing a cul-de-sac roadway bulb, combination of concrete, masonry-steel, picket fencing, and steel picket gates to effect the closure of Conestoga Drive at its west end east of 45th Street West. After construction, emergency service agencies will be given keys to enable the opening of the gates for access during an emergency.

9. **Surrounding Land Use and Settings**:

   a. Project Site – The proposed project site is located on Conestoga Drive east of its intersection with 45th Street West. Conestoga Drive is a two lane residential street with one lane of traffic in each direction.

   b. Surrounding Properties – The surrounding properties consist of single-family residences to the east and a property owned by the Lancaster Unified School District under development to construct a middle school to the west. The topography is generally flat and animal life within the surrounding area consists of animals typically found within a developed residential area, such as domesticated pets, rodents, birds, and insects. Plant life within the area consists of mostly landscaped trees, bushes, and lawns. No known endangered species or species of a special concern exist within the project area.

10. **Other agencies whose approval is required (and permits needed)**: None.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) "Potential Significant Impact" is appropriate if an effect is significant or potentially significant or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more "Potential Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.

4) "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potential Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVIII, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other California Environmental Quality Act process, and effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVIII at the end of the checklist.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). See the sample question below. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

CONESTOGA DRIVE AT 45TH STREET WEST

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS -Would the project:						
	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
	b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?				X
	c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
	d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES -In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:						
	a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?				X
	b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?				X
	c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use?				X
III. AIR QUALITY -Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:						
	a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
	b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
	c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for zone precursors)?				X
	d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
	e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -Would the project:						
	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
	b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
	c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
	d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident, migratory fish, or wildlife species; or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors; or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
	e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
	f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan; Natural Community Conservation Plan; or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?				X
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -Would the project:						
	a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				X
	b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
	c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
	d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -Would the project:						
	a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a know fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
		ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
		iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
		iv) Landslides?				X
	b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
	c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?				X
	d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
	e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -Would the project:						
	a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
	b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
	c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
	d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code, Section 65962.5, and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
	e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
	g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
	h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -Would the project:						
	a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
	b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
	c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X
	d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X
	e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
	f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
	g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
	h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
	i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
	j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -Would the project:						
	a)	Physically divide an established community?			X	
	b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
	c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
X. MINERAL RESOURCES -Would the project:						
	a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
	b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				X
XI. NOISE -Would the project result in:						
	a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
	b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
	c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
	d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
	e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
	f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -Would the project:						
	a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
	c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES -						
	a)	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
		Fire protection?				X
		Police protection?				X
		Schools?				X
		Parks?				X
		Other public facilities?				X
XIV. RECREATION -						
	a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
	b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -Would the project:						
	a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X	
	b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?				X
	c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
	d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
	e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?				X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
	g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -Would the project:						
	a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
	b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
	c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
	d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
	e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
	f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
	g)	Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE -						
	a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
	b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively Considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)				X
	c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

XVIII. DISCUSSION OF WAYS TO MITIGATE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

- Section 15041 (a) of the State CEQA guidelines states that a lead agency for a project has authority to require changes in any or all activities involved in the project in order to lessen or avoid significant effects on the environment. No significant effects have been identified.

P:\PDPUB\TEMP\EP&A\EU\PROJECTS\ `

ATTACHMENT A

DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

CONESTOGA DRIVE AT 45TH STREET WEST - ROADWAY CLOSURE

I. AESTHETICS - Would the proposal:

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

No impact. The proposed project is not within proximity of any scenic vistas.

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

No impact. The proposed project does not involve any scenic resources or any State scenic highway.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Less than significant impact. The proposed project consists of constructing a cul-de-sac roadway bulb, combination concrete masonry-steel picket fencing, and steel picket gates. This will slightly alter the general view of the area but not significantly. Therefore, the proposed project impact on visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings will be less than significant.

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

Less than significant impact. There is existing street lighting in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project. The project itself does not include any proposed new lighting. The nature of surface materials proposed in the project is not expected to be a source of glare or adversely affect day or nighttime views.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - Would the proposal:

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

No impact. The proposed project is located within a residential street, within the road right of way. Thus, the project will have no impact on farmland.

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

No impact. The proposed project is located within a residential street, within the road right of way, and will not conflict with any existing zoning for agriculture or Williamson Act contract.

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use?

No impact. The proposed project does not involve changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use.

III. AIR QUALITY - Would the proposal:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

No impact. The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works currently complies with dust control measures enforced by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The proposed project will not conflict with the current implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less than significant impact. Construction-related emissions and dust would be emitted during project construction. However, the effect would be temporary and would not significantly alter the ambient air quality of the area. Construction activities would be restricted to the construction times allowed by the Department of Public Works, except during emergency situations. By permit to be issued by the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works to the contractor for the private developer of this project, the permit

would require the contractor to control dust by appropriate means such as sweeping and/or watering and comply with applicable air pollution regulations. If the transportation of excess excavated material were necessary, the contractor would be required to cover the material with a tarp to reduce dust emissions and prevent falling debris. Thus, the impacts would be temporary and can be considered less than significant.

c) ***Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?***

No impact. The emissions generated as a result of the proposed project will occur only during construction. These emissions would be temporary and are not expected to result in a cumulative net increase of pollutants. Project specifications will require the contractor to comply with Federal and State emission control regulations. Therefore, the proposed project construction will not lead to emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors.

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

No impact. No sensitive receptors such as churches or schools exist in the immediate area. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose any sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

e) ***Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?***

Less than significant impact. Objectionable odors may be generated by diesel trucks used for the construction of the project. These types of odors will be short-term and temporary. Therefore, the impact of creating objectionable odors is considered less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the proposal:

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

No impact. The project is located on a residential street and within the road right of way. No sensitive or special status species, or any species identified as a candidate in local or regional plans, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are known to exist at the project site. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on sensitive or special status species or their respective habitat.

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

No impact. The project would not be constructed within any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. Therefore, no impacts to a riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community would occur.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No impact. The proposed project does not involve a wetland habitat. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact wetland habitat.

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

No impact. There are no known migratory wildlife corridors located at the proposed project location. Also, the project is not proposed within a watercourse or any body of water. Therefore, there will be no impact on resident or migratory fish or wildlife nursery sites.

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

No impact. There are no known locally protected biological resources exist at the project site Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

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

No impact. No known adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan exists within the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on any of these plans.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the proposal:

a-d) ***Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5 or directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?***

No impact. The proposed project is located within the street right of way. No known paleontological, archaeological, and historical resources exist in the project area. However, if any cultural resources, including human remains, are discovered during construction, the contractor shall cease excavation and contact a specialist to examine the project sites as required by project permitting. Thus, the effects of the proposed project on these resources are not considered significant.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the proposal:

a) ***Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:***

i) ***Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.***

No impact. There are no known active faults underlying the project site and we do not anticipate a fault rupture occurring at the project site.

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

No impact. The proposed project requires excavation and grading of soil. However, the project area has not been the epicenter of any known earthquakes and; therefore, the project activities are not associated with factors that are known to trigger a strong seismic ground shaking.

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

No impact. The project area is not known to have suffered any liquefaction or identified as a potential liquefaction area. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on liquefaction.

iv) ***Landslides?***

No impact. The project location is in a residential and commercial area, consisting of relatively flat terrain; it does not contain any geologic features (i.e., hills or mountains), which may adversely cause landslides. Therefore, the project will have no impact on landslides.

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

No impact. Construction of the proposed project would result in disruption, excavation, displacement, and compaction of soil. Project specifications would require the contractor to properly backfill and compact the soil and properly dispose of any excess excavated materials. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on the loss of top soil or soil erosion.

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

No impact. The proposed project site is not known to be on soil that is unstable. Project permitting will require the contractor to dispose of surplus materials in accordance with all applicable Federal, State, or local regulations. Thus, the project will have no impact on unstable soil or geologic unit.

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

No impact. The soil at the project location is not considered expansive. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact soil expansion.

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

No impact. There are no septic tanks or sewer pipes at the project site. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the proposal:

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

No impact. The proposed project does not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment or emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances or wastes within one quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Less than significant impact. Combustion engine fluids from the construction equipment are potentially hazardous substances. Necessary precautions will be taken to prevent the spillage of any hazardous substances that may affect the public or the environment at the project site. It is unlikely that an explosion, emission, or release of hazardous or acutely hazardous substances occur as a result of the proposed project. Project permitting would require the contractor to properly maintain all equipment during construction. In the event of any spills of fluids, the contractor is required to remediate according to all applicable laws regarding chemical cleanup. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in hazardous emissions or a hazardous substance spillage, thus the project impact on the public or environment is considered to be less than significant.

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

No impact. The proposed project site is not known to be on soil that is unstable. Project specifications will require the contractor to dispose of surplus materials in accordance with all applicable Federal, State, or local regulations. Thus, the project will have no impact on unstable soil or geologic unit.

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

No impact. The project site is not known to be a hazardous materials site. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on hazardous materials.

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

No impact. The proposed project is not located within an airport land or within two miles of a public airport. The proposed project will have no impact on safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

f) **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

No impact. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact relating to airstrip safety for people residing or working in the project area.

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

Less than significant impact. During construction, access will be maintained for emergency providers. After Construction, emergency service agencies will be given keys to enable the opening of gates for access during emergency. Therefore, the impact on the proposed project emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan is considered less than significant.

h) ***Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?***

No impact. The project site is located in an urbanized area with no flammable brush wildlands located in the vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to result in adverse impacts related to risks associated with wildland fires.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the proposal:

a) ***Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?***

No impact. The proposed project is located on a residential street and will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

b) ***Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?***

No impact. The proposed project would not result in the use of any water that would result in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the groundwater table. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge.

c) ***Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?***

No impact. The proposed project will not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site. Therefore, the project will have no impact.

d) ***Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?***

No impact. The proposed project would not result in changes to existing drainage patterns of the project site. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the rate or amount of surface runoff.

e) ***Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?***

No impact. The construction of the project will not result in additional surface water runoff. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems.

f) ***Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?***

No impact. The proposed project will not affect water quality and, therefore, will have no impact on the degradation of water quality.

g) ***Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?***

No impact. The proposed project will not create new housing so implementation of the proposed project will not place any housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, it will have no impact.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

No impact. The proposed project will not place any structures within a 100-year flood hazard area, which may impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, it will have no impact.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

No impact. The proposed project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding due to failure of a levee or dam. Therefore, it will have no impact.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No impact. The proposed project is not located in a coastal area and, therefore, would not be subject to inundation by seiche or a tsunami. The project is not within or adjacent to a hillside area and, therefore, not subject to mudflow. Therefore, it will have no impact.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the proposal:

a) Physically divide an established community?

Less than significant impact. The project would introduce a barrier which is on the westerly perimeter of an established unincorporated community known as Casa Grande Estates. The area to the west of this community, which is across 45th Street West, is being developed as a public middle school by the Lancaster Unified School District. Local residents, through their Casa Grande Homeowners Association, are the developers of the project and accept the resulting access limitations to the future middle school. The Lancaster Unified School District is on the record expressing that it has no objection to the project on this basis.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

No impact. The proposed project does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of the County of Los Angeles.

c) ***Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?***

No impact. The proposed project is located in a developed area. No known unique, rare, or endangered species or animals exist in the project area. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan adopted by any agency or community.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the proposal:

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

No impact. The proposed project would not deplete any mineral resource and would, therefore, have no impact on mineral resources.

b) ***Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?***

No impact. The project site is not identified as a resource recovery site in the local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on a locally-important mineral resource recovery site.

XI. NOISE - Would the proposal result in:

a) ***Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?***

Less than significant impact. The noise levels within the proposed project site would increase during construction activities. However, the impact is temporary and will be subject to existing noise ordinances and standards set by the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration. The contractor will be required to comply with the construction hours specified in the County noise control ordinances. Overall, since the construction period will last for a short period, the project would not expose people to severe noise levels; thus, the impact to severe noise levels is considered less than significant.

b) ***Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?***

Less than significant impact. Construction of the proposed project would require the use of equipment that would generate groundborne vibration or groundborne noise vibration. However, the project specifications would require the contractor to comply with all noise laws and ordinances. The project would be considered less than significant since construction would be for a short period and would not expose people to long-term excessive noise levels.

c) ***A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

No impact. The proposed construction will only increase noise levels on a temporary basis. Therefore, no permanent increase to the ambient noise levels will occur as a result of this project.

d) ***A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

Less than significant impact. During the construction phase of the project, there will be a nominal increase in existing noise levels due to construction and transportation of material to and from the project site. Due to the short-term nature of the project, the impact will be less than significant. Also, construction activities will likely be between 7 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday.

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

No impact. The proposed project is not located within two miles of a public or private airport. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact in exposing people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the proposal:

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

No impact. The proposed project will not induce a population growth, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, the project will have no impact on population growth.

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

No impact. The proposed project will not displace existing houses or people, creating a demand for replacement housing. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the construction of replacement housing.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICE - Would the proposal:

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities?

No impact. The project will not affect public service and will not result in a need for new or altered governmental services in fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities. Existing services for the area will be sufficient. However, the County will require the contractor to coordinate with the Sheriff and Fire Departments regarding construction scheduling to prevent response time delays. Thus, the project will have no impact on these services.

XIV. RECREATION - Would the proposal:

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

No impact. The proposed project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks.

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

No impact. The proposed project does not include recreational facilities and would not require the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the proposal:

a) ***Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project will require transportation of construction equipment and materials to the project site. This would minimally increase the existing traffic. However, the impact would be only during construction and is, therefore, temporary. Thus, the impact of the proposed project on substantial traffic increases is considered to be less than significant.

b) ***Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?***

No impact. The proposed project will not exceed a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for roads or highways in the project area.

c) ***Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?***

No impact. The proposed project will have no impact on air traffic patterns.

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

No impact. The proposed project does not involve any design features that are known to constitute safety hazards. Therefore, the project would have no impact on hazards due to design features.

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

No impact. The proposed project would provide a means of access to emergency service providers during an emergency.

f) ***Result in inadequate parking capacity?***

No impact. The proposed project will not result in the need for more parking. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on parking capacity.

g) ***Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?***

No impact. The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the proposal:

a) ***Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?***

No impact. The project will not result in contamination or an increase in discharge of wastewater that might affect wastewater treatment. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

b) ***Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

No impact. The proposed project will not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

c) ***Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

No impact. The proposed project consists of replacing road barrier and would not result in construction of new storm drain. Thus, the proposed project would have no impact storm water drainage.

d) ***Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?***

No impact. The proposed project will not result in a need for additional water supplies. Therefore, the project will have no impact on existing water supply entitlements and resources.

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

No impact. No increase in the number of wastewater discharge facilities will occur as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on wastewater treatment.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

No impact. The proposed project will not generate any significant amount of solid waste during construction and no waste after construction is completed. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on landfill capacity.

g) Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No impact. The project would comply with all Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE - Would the proposal:

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

No impact. Based on findings in this environmental review, the proposed project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish and wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on the quality of the environment.

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

No impact. The proposed project would not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulative considerable.

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

No impact. The proposed project would not have a direct or indirect detrimental environmental impact on human beings.

GAJ:kw
P:\TLPUB\INVEST\INV\ND DISCUSSION CONESTOGA.DOC