**AGENDA ITEM:** 6.

**DATE:** 09-17-12

**STAFF REPORT**

**DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 89-01**
**GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 12-02**
**ZONE CHANGE NO. 12-02**
**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 12-08**
**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 12-09**

DATE: September 17, 2012

TO: Lancaster Planning Commission

FROM: Planning Department

APPLICANT: Silverado Power, LLC

LOCATION: The Development Agreement, General Plan Amendment and Zone Change apply to a combined total of 216± acres of the 293± acres under consideration between the two locations.

The solar facilities will occupy 293± gross acres on two separate sites:

Site 1: 135± acres generally bounded by Avenue G, Avenue H, 90th Street West, and 95th Street West (CUP 12-08);

Site 2: 158± acres bounded by Avenue H, Avenue H-8, 100th Street West, and 105th Street West (CUP 12-09)

REQUEST:

1. Rescind Development Agreement No. 89-01 on the subject properties
2. Amend General Plan land use designation for the subject properties from UR (Urban Residential) to NU (Non-Urban Residential)
3. Rezone subject properties from R-7,000 (Single Family Residential, minimum lot size 7,000 square feet) and R-10,000 (Single Family Residential, minimum lot size 10,000 square feet) to RR-2.5 (Rural Residential, minimum lot size 2.5 acres)
4. Construction of a 20 megawatt photovoltaic solar generating facility in the RR-2.5 Zone.
5. Construction of a 40 megawatt photovoltaic solar generating facility in the RR-2.5 Zone.

RECOMMENDATION:

1 Adopt Resolution No. 12-19 recommending to the City Council rescinding of Development Agreement No. 89-01 on the subject properties.

2. Adopt Resolution No. 12-20 recommending to the City Council approval of General Plan Amendment No. 12-02 on the subject properties.

3. Adopt Resolution No. 12-21 recommending to the City Council approval of Zone Change No. 12-02 on the subject properties.

4. Adopt Resolution No. 12-22 approving Conditional Use Permit No. 12-08. The approval of CUP No. 12-08 is not valid until the effective date of General Plan Amendment No. 12-02 and Zone Change No. 12-02.

5. Adopt Resolution No. 12-23 approving Conditional Use Permit No. 12-09. The approval of CUP No. 12-09 is not valid until the effective date of General Plan Amendment No. 12-02 and Zone Change No. 12-02.

BACKGROUND: There have been no prior hearings before the Planning Commission or City Council concerning the northern 77 acres of Site 1.

The southern 58 acres of Site 1 and all of Site 2, for a total of 216 acres, were originally part of the Del Sur Ranch project which was approved in February 1990. As part of the Del Sur Ranch project, Tentative Tract Map No. 46250 was approved on the subject properties for 696 single family residential lots in the R-7,000 and R-10,000 zone by the Planning Commission. This Tentative Map expires concurrently with Development Agreement No. 89-01 on October 18, 2012.

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION, EXISTING ZONING AND LAND USE: Site 1 is designated UR (Urban Residential) and NU (Non-Urban Residential), and is zoned R-7,000 (Single Family Residential, minimum lot size 7,000 square feet), R-10,000 (Single Family Residential, minimum lot size 10,000 square feet), and RR-2.5 (Rural Residential, minimum lot size 2.5 acres). The northern half of the project site (77 acres) is an active alfalfa field. The southern portion of the project site (58 acres) consists of fallow agricultural fields. The General Plan designation, zoning, and land use of the properties surrounding the northern half of Site 1 are as follows:

| | GENERAL PLAN | ZONING | LAND USE |
|---|---|---|---|
| NORTH | County | A-1-1 (Light Agricultural) | Vacant |
| | P (Public Use) | S (School) | Vacant |
| EAST | County | A-2-1 (Heavy Agricultural) | Single Family Residences |
| SOUTH | UR | R-7,000; R-10,000 | Vacant |
| WEST | UR | R-10,000 | Vacant |

The General Plan designation, zoning, and land use of the properties surrounding the southern half of Site 1 are as follows:

| | GENERAL PLAN | ZONING | LAND USE |
|---|---|---|---|
| NORTH | County | A-2-1 | Vacant |
| EAST | NU | RR-2.5 | Alfalfa fields and vineyard |
| SOUTH | County | A-2-1 | Vacant |
| | P | S | Del Sur Elementary School |
| WEST | UR | R-7,000; R-10,000 | Vacant |

Site 2 is designated UR, zoned R-7,000 and R-10,000 and is vacant. The General Plan designation, zoning, and land use of the surrounding properties are as follows:

| | GENERAL PLAN | ZONING | LAND USE |
|---|---|---|---|
| NORTH | UR | R-7,000 | Vacant |
| | C (Commercial) | CPD (Commercial Planned Development) | |
| EAST | NU | RR-2.5 | Solar facility under construction |
| SOUTH | County | A-1-1 (Light Agricultural) | Vacant |
| WEST | County | A-1-1 | Vacant |

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS: Site 1 is bounded on the east by 90th Street West, to the north by Avenue G, and to the south by Avenue H. No roadways are located to the west of the project site. Both 90th Street West and Avenue G are improved with one lane in each direction. Avenue H is an unimproved, dirt road from 110th Street West to 90th Street West. To the east of 90th Street West, Avenue H is improved with one lane in each direction in the vicinity of the project site.

Site 2 is bounded to the north by Avenue H. No roadways are immediately adjacent to the project site on the west, south or east. Avenue I is located approximately ½ mile south of the project site, and is improved with one lane in each direction. Avenue H is an unimproved, dirt road in the vicinity of the project site.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: Review of pertinent environmental documents has disclosed no significant adverse impacts from the proposed project after mitigation measures have been applied.

Potential effects are discussed more fully in the attached Initial Study. The Initial Study prepared for the proposed project was sent to the State Clearinghouse (SCH# 2012061029) for public review. The 30-day public review period ended on July 10, 2012. The Initial Study was subsequently revised due to changes in the project description, and recirculated for another 30-day public review period. The second public review period ended on September 13, 2012. Based on this information, staff has determined that a Mitigated Negative Declaration is warranted. Notice of Intent to prepare a Mitigated Negative Declaration has been legally advertised.

Effective January 1, 1991, applicants whose projects have the potential to result in the loss of fish, wildlife, or habitat through urbanization and/or land use conversion are required to pay filing fees as set forth under Section 711.4 of the Fish and Game Code. Pursuant to Section 21089(b) of the Public Resources Code, the approval of a project is not valid, and no development right is vested, until such fees are paid.

LEGAL NOTICE: Notice of Public Hearing was mailed to all property owners within a 1,500-foot radius of each project, posted in three places, posted on the subject properties, and noticed in a newspaper of general circulation per prescribed procedure.

ANALYSIS: The applicant, Silverado Power LLC, is requesting two conditional use permits for the construction and operation of photovoltaic (PV) solar electric energy generating facilities in a Rural Residential Zone. The proposed projects consist of rows of PV panels, which would either be fixed or on trackers. These panels would generate 20 megawatts (MW) of electricity on Site 1, and 40 MW of electricity on Site 2. According to Section 17.080.70.DD of the Lancaster Municipal Code, a conditional use permit is required for the construction and operation of a solar plant in a Rural Residential Zone.

The City of Lancaster has determined that the development and use of alternative energy is beneficial to the community, and this determination is evident in the decisions made by the City Council. The City Council has implemented several solar and wind energy programs/ordinances, has installed solar panels on City facilities, and has moved to become a provider of solar generated electricity to local school districts and other entities. Additionally, the City's General Plan has several objectives/policies pertaining to alternative energy. These objectives/policies address the need to develop new sources of energy, as well as reduce energy consumption. The proposed project is consistent with the City's goals as addressed in Policy 3.6.6, "Consider and promote the use of alternative energy such as wind energy and solar energy" and Specific Action 3.6.6(a), "Work with utility companies and private enterprises in their efforts to incorporate alternative energy resources including…solar energy". Additionally, the State of California has a mandate that requires all electricity providers to obtain 30 percent of their electricity from renewable sources by 2020. While the City encourages businesses and residences to install solar on their rooftops, carports, shade structures, etc., this type of behind-the-meter solar is currently limited to 5% of peak demand in a utility's territory.[1]

[1] Weissman, Steven and Nathaniel Johnson, The Statewide Benefits of Net-Metering in California & the Consequences of Changes to the Program, Berkeley Law, University of California, Center for Law, Energy & the Environment, February 17, 2012.

**DA 89-01, GPA 12-02, ZC 12-02**

The southern half of Site 1 and all of Site 2 were part of the Del Sur Ranch project that was originally approved by the City of Lancaster in February 1990, and covered by Development Agreement No. 89-01, which became effective on April 17, 1990. This Development Agreement established certain time frames and requirements for the development of the project, and has been amended several times to incorporate changes in the project description, General Plan designations, zoning and the subdivision map. The subject properties were ultimately sold to another developer for the construction of 696 single family residences under Tentative Tract Map 46250. The underlying General Plan designation and zoning on the subject properties does not allow for the development of solar generating facilities. The Development Agreement on the subject properties does not expire until October 18, 2012; however, while the Development Agreement is in effect, the General Plan and Zoning designations cannot be changed. Therefore, the property owner (Munimae) has submitted a letter to the City requesting that the Development Agreement be rescinded on the subject properties.

As previously stated, the General Plan land use designations and zoning for most of the project sites do not allow for the development of commercial solar facilities. Additionally, the project sites are currently approved for the development of 696 single family residential lots, which is not consistent with the goals and policies of the City's General Plan with respect to alternative energy. The approved residential subdivision is designated as an urban residential area, but is generally surrounded by the non-urban residential/agricultural uses and not in proximity to goods and services that are necessary for urban developments. As such, it is not consistent with Policy 3.6.1 which promotes the reduction of energy consumption by establishing land use patterns, which would decrease automobile travel. A total of 216 gross acres of the 293 gross acres would need to have the General Plan land use designation and zoning changed in order to allow for the development of the commercial solar facilities (58 acres at Site 1 and 158 acres at Site 2). Therefore, amendment of the General Plan land use designation to NU (Non-Urban) and rezoning the project sites to RR-2.5 is necessary to allow the proposed projects to move forward.

The placement of solar facilities on the westside of Lancaster is attractive to solar developers for a number of reasons including the availability of previously disturbed land and the proximity of existing transmission lines/capacity. The applicant is proposing the development of two separate solar generating facilities: Site 1 (CUP 12-08) and Site 2 (CUP 12-09).

**Site 1 (CUP 12-08)**

The proposed project at Site 1 would operate year-round, producing a total of 20 MW of renewable electric power during daytime hours. Power generated by the proposed project would be sold to Southern California Edison. The proposed project consists of rows of photovoltaic panels. These panels would be either fixed or mounted on trackers, depending upon the chosen technology. These photovoltaic panels would convert sunlight directly into electrical energy without the use of heat transfer fluid or cooling water. An inverter/electrical equipment pad would be located in the center of each block of panels. A substation would be located near the entry gate along 90$^{th}$ Street West, and would feed the electricity to the Del Sur Substation located on the southeast corner of Avenue H and 90$^{th}$ Street West, via a gen-tie line. A chain-link fence would surround the project site, and a

10-foot landscaped area would be provided between the fence and property line to screen the development from the surrounding uses. Access to the project site would be provided via a gate on 90th Street West and a gate on Avenue G. These gates would be set back 40 feet from the edge of right-of-way to allow vehicles to fully pull off the roadway when accessing the project site.

Irrevocable offers of dedication would be provided for Avenue G, Avenue H, Avenue G-8, 90th Street West and 95th Street West. Avenue G, Avenue H, and 90th Street West would be dedicated at 50 feet from centerline; Avenue G-8 and 95th Street West would be dedicated at 42 feet from centerline; and 93rd Street West would be dedicated at 32 feet from centerline. A Master Plan of Drainage facility is proposed to run along Avenue G-8. This earthen channel is proposed to be 90-feet wide and 7-feet deep. The applicant shall provide an irrevocable offer of dedication for this future facility.

The proposed project has the potential to impact views from the surrounding roads and nearby residences and school. The photovoltaic panels would be approximately 10 feet high, with a maximum height of 14 feet. The height of the panels is dependent upon the specific technology chosen by the applicant. While the views of the project site would change, the development would not impede the long-range views of the mountain ranges. Additionally, the entire site would be fenced and 10-feet of landscaping would be provided between the fence and the property line. This landscaping would be drought tolerant, is likely to be native, and would screen the development from view. Any existing trees/large shrubs along the property line would be incorporated into the project landscaping.

An air quality analysis was conducted that demonstrated that construction emissions associated with the proposed project would not exceed the thresholds established by the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District. The applicant would also be required to prepare and implement a dust control plan in accordance with AVAQMD Rule 403. Operation of the proposed project would result in minimal amounts of air emissions only during times of site maintenance. As a portion of the project site is currently under agricultural production, implementation of the proposed project would result in a net reduction of air emissions.

The northern half of the project site contains an existing single family residence, which is part of the active agricultural use. This house was constructed in 1939 and was subsequently modified. A cultural resources investigation was conducted on the property and included an evaluation of the residence. This evaluation concluded that the residence is not historically significant and no significant cultural impacts would occur as a result of its demolition during the construction of the proposed project.

Construction of the proposed project would generate noise which could potentially be heard off-site at the adjacent single family residences and Del Sur Elementary. Mitigation measures are required which would reduce potential noise impacts to a less than significant level. Additionally, the applicant is working with the school district to coordinate schedules to minimize disruption at the school to the extent feasible. Minimal amounts of noise would be generated during routine maintenance of the panels and landscaping; however, during typical operation no noise is expected as the panels and tracking systems are silent. Most of the time the facility would be remotely operated.

Additional environmental impacts could be generated during construction of the proposed project with respect to biological resources and hazards/hazardous materials. The construction of the proposed project has the potential to impact burrowing owls and Swainson's hawk (foraging) during vegetation removal and grading operations. Mitigation measures have been identified, which require the applicant to conduct preconstruction surveys prior to the issuance of any permits (grading, building, etc). In the event that burrowing owls are occupying the site or Swainson's hawks are utilizing the site for foraging, the applicant shall coordinate with the California Department of Fish and Game to determine the appropriate procedures/mitigation. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Due to the age of the single family residence, lead-based paint and asbestos may be present. Additionally, PCBs may be present in the transformer located on one of the power poles on the project site. These hazardous materials would be removed in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations. There are also be irrigation wells located on the project site. If these water wells are not to be utilized during the operation of the proposed project, the applicant shall abandon/close the wells in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations

**Site 2 (CUP 12-09)**

The proposed project at Site 2 would operate year-round, producing a total of 40 MW of renewable electric power during daytime hours. Power generated by the proposed project would be sold to Southern California Edison. The proposed project consists of rows of photovoltaic panels. These panels could be a maximum of 14 feet in height, but are likely to be substantially smaller, and would either be fixed or mounted on trackers depending upon the specific technology chosen. These photovoltaic panels would convert sunlight directly into electrical energy without the use of heat transfer fluid or cooling water. An inverter/electrical equipment pad would be located in the center of each block of solar panels. These inverters would be approximately 90 inches (7.5 feet) in height. A substation would be located on the southeastern corner of the project site, and would feed the electricity to the proposed Antelope Solar Greenworks Substation located at the northeast corner of future Lancaster Blvd and 97$^{th}$ Street West via a gen-tie line. A chain-link fence would surround the project site, and a 10-foot landscaped area would be provided between the fence and the property line to screen the development from the surrounding uses. A 30-foot paved access road would be provided to the project site either from Avenue I via 100$^{th}$ Street West (primary route) or from 90$^{th}$ Street West via Avenue H (alternate route). Access to the project site would be provided via a gate on 100$^{th}$ Street West.

Avenue H and 100$^{th}$ Street West would both be dedicated at 50 feet from centerline. Irrevocable offers of dedication would be provided for Avenue H-8 and 105$^{th}$ Street West at 42 feet from centerline.

The proposed project may have the potential to impact views from the distant land uses and roadways. No paved roadways exist in the vicinity of the project site. Avenue H and 100$^{th}$ Street West are dirt roads, but are not routinely used by vehicles. The closest paved roads are Avenue I, approximately 0.5 miles south of the project site and 110$^{th}$ Street West, approximately 0.5 miles west of the project site. The photovoltaic panels are anticipated to be approximately 10 feet high and would not exceed 14 feet. The entire site would be fenced and 10-feet of landscaping would be

provided between the fence and the property line. This landscaping would be drought tolerant, is likely to be native, and would screen the development from view.

A 30-foot paved access road to the project site will be provided either along 100th Street West or Avenue H as previously mentioned. For the purposes of the air quality analysis, the route along Avenue H was assumed as a worst case scenario, because it is longer than the route along 100th Street West. This roadway would be paved and operational prior to the start of construction on Site 2. This roadway along with the preparation and implementation of a dust control plan in accordance with AVAQMD Rule 403 would ensure that impacts from dust during construction and operation of the site are minimal.

Construction of the proposed project would generate noise, which could potentially be heard off-site. However, there are no sensitive receptors immediately adjacent to the project site. The closest sensitive receptors are the handful of single family residences located approximately 0.25 miles to the east and southeast of the project site. These residences are buffered from the project site by a line of tamarisk trees and a solar development currently under construction. Additionally, mitigation measures are required, which would reduce potential noise impacts to a less than significant level. Minimal amounts of noise would be generated during routine maintenance of the panels and landscaping; however, during typical operation no noise is expected, as the panels and tracking systems are silent. Most of the time the facility would be remotely operated.

Additional environmental impacts could be generated during construction of the proposed project with respect to biological resources and hazards. The construction of the proposed project has the potential to impact burrowing owls and Swainson's hawk (foraging) during vegetation removal and grading operations. Mitigation measures have been identified, which require the applicant to conduct preconstruction surveys prior to the issuance of any permits (grading, building, etc). In the event that burrowing owls are occupying the site or Swainson's hawks are utilizing the site for foraging, the applicant shall coordinate with the California Department of Fish and Game to determine the appropriate procedures/mitigation. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

There may also be old irrigation wells located on the project site. If these water wells are present, and will not be utilized during the operation of the proposed project, the applicant shall abandon/close the wells in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations.

Therefore, staff is recommending that the Commission approve the conditional use permits subject to the proposed conditions, based on the service having sufficient area to accommodate the proposed development, adequate access and services being available as needed for solar facilities, and the lack of significant adverse effects on the surrounding area.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

Jocelyn Swain, Associate Planner - Environmental

cc: Applicant
Engineer

**RESOLUTION NO. 12-19**

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL THE RESCINDING OF DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 89-01 ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTIES

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 65864 et. seq. of the Government Code of the State of California, the City of Lancaster previously entered into Development Agreement 89-01 for the Del Sur Ranch project; and

WHEREAS, the Development Agreement has been amended on multiple occasions; and

WHEREAS, solar power generating facilities are not an allowable use under the current zoning and Development Agreement pertaining to the subject properties; and

WHEREAS, Section 3.4 of Development Agreement No. 89-01 provides for the mutual cancellation of the Agreement in accordance with the provisions of the Government Code; and

WHEREAS, in response to a request from the property owner of the subject properties (Exhibit A), both the City and the property owner are desirous of terminating the Agreement for the purpose of mutual benefit to both parties; and

WHEREAS, notice of intention to rescind the development agreement for the subject properties was given as required in Section 65867 of the Government Code of the State of California; and

WHEREAS, public hearing was held before the Lancaster Planning Commission on September 17, 2012, regarding the proposed rescinding of the development agreement; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed and concurred that the termination of the Development Agreement is covered by the Initial Study prepared for the proposed projects (SCH #2012061029) and recommends to the City Council termination of this development agreement; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby adopts the following findings in support of approval of this application:

1. The termination of the Development Agreement on the subject properties is consistent with the adopted General Plan because it will facilitate implementation of the following objective and policy of the General Plan:

   "Encourage efficient use of energy resources through the promotion of efficient land use patterns and the incorporation of energy conservation practices into new and existing development, and appropriate use of alternative energy." (Objective 3.6)

   "Consider and promote the use of alternative energy such as wind energy and solar energy." (Policy 3.6.6)

2. The termination of the Development Agreement would make possible the General Plan amendment and rezoning of the subject properties to be more consistent with the surrounding rural residential land uses and zoning designations.

3. The proposed development agreement amendment will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and general welfare, because any future solar development on the subject property would be less intensive than the uses urban residential uses currently approved for the subject property.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. This Commission hereby recommends to the City Council the termination of Development Agreement No. 89-01 on the subject properties as shown in Exhibit "A".

PASSED, APPROVED and ADOPTED this 17th day of September 2012, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

JAMES D. VOSE, Chairman
Lancaster Planning Commission

ATTEST:

BRIAN S. LUDICKE, Planning Director
City of Lancaster

ORDINANCE NO.

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA, RESCINDING DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 89-01 ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTIES

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 65864 et. seq. of the Government Code of the State of California, the City previously entered into Development Agreement No. 89-01 for the Del Sur Ranch project; and

WHEREAS, the Development Agreement has been amended on multiple occasions; and

WHEREAS, solar power generating facilities are not an allowable use under the current zoning and Development Agreement pertaining to the subject properties; and

WHEREAS, Section 3.4 of Development Agreement No. 89-01 provides for the mutual cancellation of the Agreement in accordance with the provisions of the Government Code; and

WHEREAS, in response to a request from the property owner of the subject properties (Exhibit A), both the City and the property owner are desirous of terminating the Agreement for the purpose of mutual benefit to both parties; and

WHEREAS, notice of intention to rescind the development agreement for the subject properties was given as required in Section 65867 of the Government Code of the State of California; and

WHEREAS, public hearings on the termination of the Development Agreement were held before the Lancaster Planning Commission on September 17, 2012 and the City Council on _____; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed and approved the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (SCH #2012061029) prepared for the proposed projects in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the State Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act prior to taking action; and

WHEREAS, the City Council hereby makes the following findings in support of the Development Agreement Amendment:

1. The termination of the Development Agreement on the subject properties is consistent with the adopted General Plan because it will facilitate implementation of the following objective and policy of the General Plan:

   "Encourage efficient use of energy resources through the promotion of efficient land use patterns and the incorporation of energy conservation practices into new and existing development, and appropriate use of alternative energy." (Objective 3.6)

"Consider and promote the use of alternative energy such as wind energy and solar energy." (Policy 3.6.6)

2. The termination of the Development Agreement would make possible the General Plan amendment and rezoning of the subject properties to be more consistent with the surrounding rural residential land uses and zoning designations.

3. The proposed development agreement amendment will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and general welfare, because any future solar development on the subject property would be less intensive than the uses urban residential uses currently approved for the subject property.

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA, DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The City Council hereby approves the termination of Development Agreement No. 89-01 on the subject properties as shown in Exhibit "A".

Section 2. That the City Clerk shall certify to the passage of this Ordinance and will see that it is published and posted in the manner required by law.

I, Geri K. Bryan, CMC, City Clerk of the City of Lancaster, do hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was regularly introduced and placed upon its first reading on the ____ day of _____, 2012, and placed upon its second reading and adoption at a regular meeting of the City Council on the ____ day of _____, 2012, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

_____
GERI K. BRYAN, CMC
City Clerk
City of Lancaster

APPROVED:

_____
R. REX PARRIS
Mayor
City of Lancaster

CERTIFICATION OF ORDINANCE
CITY COUNCIL

I, _____, _____ City of Lancaster, California, do hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of the original Ordinance No. , for which the original is on file in my office.

WITNESS MY HAND AND THE SEAL OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER, on this _____ day of the _____, _____.

_____
(seal)

**RESOLUTION NO. 12-20**

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE ADOPTED GENERAL PLAN OF THE CITY KNOWN AS GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 12-02

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 3.c. of City Council Resolution No. 93-07 an amendment to the adopted General Plan of the City has been initiated by the Silverado Power, LLC to re-designate 216± acres from UR (Urban Residential) to NU (Non-Urban Residential); and

WHEREAS, notice of intention to consider the General Plan amendment on the subject properties was given as required in Section 17.24.110 of the Zoning Ordinance and Section 65854 and 65905 of the Government Code of the State of California; and

WHEREAS, staff has performed necessary investigations, prepared a written report, and recommended that the General Plan amendment be approved; and

WHEREAS, a public notice was provided as required by law and a public hearing on the General Plan amendment was held on September 17, 2012; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby certifies that it has reviewed and considered the information in the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed projects in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the State Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act prior to taking action; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby finds, pursuant to Section 21082.1 of the Public Resource Code, that the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed projects reflects the independent judgment of the City of Lancaster; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby finds that the Initial Study determined that the proposed projects could have a significant effect on the environment; however, there will not be a significant effect in this case with the implementation of mitigation measures as detailed in Exhibit "A" (CUP 12-08) and Exhibit "B" (CUP 12-09); and

WHEREAS, this Commission based on the evidence in the record, hereby adopts the following findings in support of approval of General Plan Amendment No. 12-02 and recommends that the City Council adopt them:

1. There is a need for the proposed land use designation of NU (Non-Urban Residential) on the project sites, because most of the Non-Urban residential property is in smaller parcels and not under single ownership suitable for development of solar energy facilities.

2. The proposed designation of NU will be compatible with the existing land use designation of NU and Light and Heavy Agriculture (County) surrounding a majority of

the project sites; further, the current designation of UR (Urban Residential) is not compatible with the surrounding area.

3. The proposed amendment is consistent with and implements Goal 19 of the General Plan, "to achieve an attractive and unique image for the community by creating a sustainable, cohesive and enduring built environment."

4. The proposed amendment is consistent with the following goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan for the reasons stated below:

   **Objective 3.6** "Encourage efficient use of energy resources through the promotion of efficient land use patterns and the incorporation of energy conservation practices into new and existing development, and appropriate use of alternative energy."

   **Policy 3.6.1** "Reduce energy consumption by establishing land use patterns which would decrease automobile travel and increase the usage of energy efficient modes of transportation." The proposed project would change an urban residential designation which would have allowed the development of 696 single family residences. In order to obtain goods and services, these residents would have been required to drive significant distances. The NU designation and subsequent solar facility development would generate minimal vehicle trips.

   **Policy 3.6.6** "Consider and promote the use of alternative energy such as wind energy and solar energy."

5. There are no goals, objectives, policies, or specific actions of the General Plan that would conflict with the proposed amendment.

6. The proposed amendment would not adversely affect the economic health of the City, because the development proposed would not create a need for significant City services.

7 The proposed amendment would reduce the demand on the groundwater as compared to existing and previous agricultural uses or the approved urban residential subdivision. Groundwater from existing wells located on the project sites would be utilized for the occasional washing of the solar panels. Wells not needed for the operation of the facilities would be closed in accordance with existing regulations.

8. The proposed site could be adequately served by services necessary for a solar energy facility, including police and fire, based on responses from affected service agencies.

9. The proposed amendment will not have an adverse effect on traffic and circulation systems as noted in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. Upon completion of construction, minimal amounts of traffic associated with occasional maintenance

operations would be generated and no traffic impacts would occur. No mitigation measures with respect to traffic are required.

10. The proposed amendment and subsequent construction of the photovoltaic facilities would create environmental impacts as discussed in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration. Potential impacts with respect to air quality, biological resources, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, and noise would be created as a result of construction activities. Mitigation measures are required which would reduce the impacts to a less than significant level. No impacts would occur as a result of the operation of the facility.

11. The proposed amendment is in the public interest because it will help to meet the State's established goals of using renewable resources to generate a portion of California's electricity. The proposed amendment will allow for the development of photovoltaic electric generating facilities which can be adequately served by streets, utilities, and public services in the area; and, the proposed land use designation would not adversely affect the regional water supply or the City's economic health.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

This Commission hereby recommends to the City Council approval of General Plan Amendment No. 12-02 to re-designate the subject property from UR to NU.

PASSED, APPROVED and ADOPTED this 17th day of September 2012, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

JAMES D. VOSE, Chairman
Lancaster Planning Commission

ATTEST:

BRIAN S. LUDICKE, Planning Director
City of Lancaster

**RESOLUTION NO. 12-21**

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE ADOPTED ZONING PLAN FOR THE CITY, KNOWN AS ZONE CHANGE NO. 12-02

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 17.24.040. of the Lancaster Municipal Code, the applicant has requested the Planning Commission to consider a change to the zoning designation on the subject properties from R-7,000 (single family residential, minimum lot size 7,000 square feet) and R-10,000 (single family residential, minimum lot size 10,000 square feet) to RR-2.5 (Rural Residential, one dwelling unit per 2.5 acres); and

WHEREAS, notice of intention to consider the zone change of the subject properties was given as required in Section 17.24.110 of the Zoning Ordinance and Section 65854 and 65905 of the Government Code of the State of California; and

WHEREAS, staff has performed necessary investigations, prepared a written report, and recommended that the zone change request be approved; and

WHEREAS, a public notice was provided as required by law and a public hearing on the zone change request was held on September 17, 2012; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby certifies that it has reviewed and considered the information in the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed projects in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the State Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act prior to taking action; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby finds, pursuant to Section 21082.1 of the Public Resource Code, that the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed projects reflects the independent judgment of the City of Lancaster; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby finds that the Initial Study determined that the proposed projects could have a significant effect on the environment; however, there will not be a significant effect in this case with the implementation of mitigation measures as detailed in Exhibit "A" (CUP 12-08) and Exhibit "B" (CUP 12-09); and

WHEREAS, this Commission, based on the evidence contained in the record, hereby makes the following findings in support of the approval of Zone Change No. 12-02, and recommends that the City Council adopt them:

1. The proposed Zone Change from R-7,000 and R-10,000 to RR-2.5 will be consistent with the proposed General Plan land use designation of NU requested by the applicant.

2. Modified conditions including a change in the sites' General Plan land use designation to provide for suitable alternative energy sites, warrant a revision in the zoning for the subject

properties which would allow the development of photovoltaic solar electric generating facilities.

3. A need for the proposed zone classification of RR-2.5 exists within such area in order to allow for the development of larger scale solar energy developments. Property zoned as RR-2.5 exists in the area; however, it is in smaller parcels with different owners making it difficult to develop solar energy projects of this scale.

4. The particular properties under consideration are a proper location for said zone classification within such area, because they are surrounded by similar rural zoning and are served by adequate public access and necessary services for photovoltaic solar facilities.

5. Placement of the proposed RR-2.5 residential zone at such location will be in the interest of public health, safety and general welfare and in conformity with good zoning practices, because adequate services, access, and electrical infrastructure exist to accommodate the proposed type of development, and the zoning designation will not result in the development of incompatible uses.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

This Commission hereby recommends to the City Council approval of Zone Change No. 12-02 through the adoption of the attached ordinance to rezone the subject property from R-7,000 and R-10,000 to RR-2.5.

PASSED, APPROVED and ADOPTED this 17th day of September 2012, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

JAMES D. VOSE, Chairman
Lancaster Planning Commission

ATTEST:

BRIAN S. LUDICKE, Planning Director
City of Lancaster

ORDINANCE NO.

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA, AMENDING THE CITY ZONING PLAN FOR A TOTAL OF 216± ACRES GENERALLY BOUNDED BY AVENUE G-8, AVENUE H, 90TH STREET WEST AND 350 FEET WEST OF 93RD STREET WEST AND AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF AVENUE H AND 100TH STREET WEST KNOWN AS ZONE CHANGE NO. 12-02

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 17.24.060 of the Municipal Code, a request has been filed by Silverado Power, LLC, to change the zoning designation on 216.00± acres of land generally bounded by Avenue G-8, Avenue H, 90th Street West, and 350 feet west of 93rd Street West and at the southwest corner of Avenue H and 100th Street West from R-7,000 (single family residential, minimum lot size 7,000 square feet) and R-10,000 (single family residential, minimum lot size 10,000 square feet) to RR-2.5 (rural residential, one dwelling unit per 2.5 acres); and

WHEREAS, notice of intention to consider the zone change of the subject properties was given as required in Section 17.24.110. of the Municipal Code and Section 65854 and 65905 of the Government Code of the State of California; and

WHEREAS, staff has performed necessary investigations, prepared a written report, and recommended that the zone change request be approved; and

WHEREAS, public hearings on the zone change request were held before the Planning Commission on September 17, 2012 and the City Council on _____; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed and approved the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the State Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act prior to taking action; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission adopted the mitigation measures contained in Exhibit "A" (CUP 12-08) and Exhibit "B" (CUP 12-09); and

WHEREAS, the City Council hereby makes the following findings in support of the Ordinance:

1. The proposed Zone Change from R-7,000 and R-10,000 to RR-2.5 will be consistent with the General Plan land use designation of NU requested by the applicant.

2. Modified conditions including a change in the sites' General Plan land use designation to provide for suitable alternative energy sites, warrant a revision in the zoning for the subject properties which would allow the development of photovoltaic solar electric generating facilities.

3. A need for the proposed zone classification of RR-2.5 exists within the area in order to allow for the development of larger scale solar energy developments. Property zoned as

RR-2.5 exists in the area; however, it is in smaller parcels with different owners making it difficult to develop with solar energy projects.

4. The particular properties under consideration are a proper location for said zone classification within such area, because they are surrounded by similar rural zoning and are served by adequate public access and necessary services for photovoltaic solar facilities.

5. Placement of the proposed RR-2.5 residential zone at such locations will be in the interest of public health, safety and general welfare and in conformity with good zoning practices, because adequate services, access, and electrical infrastructure exist to accommodate the proposed type of development, and the zoning designation will not result in the development of incompatible uses.

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA, DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. That the subject property is reclassified from R-7,000 and R-10,000 to RR-2.5.

Section 2. That the City Clerk shall certify to the passage of this Ordinance and will see that it is published and posted in the manner required by law.

I, Geri K. Bryan, CMC, City Clerk of the City of Lancaster, do hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was regularly introduced and placed upon its first reading on the ____ day of _____, 2012, and placed upon its second reading and adoption at a regular meeting of the City Council on the ____ day of _____, 2012, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

_____
GERI K. BRYAN, CMC
City Clerk
City of Lancaster

APPROVED:

_____
R. REX PARRIS
Mayor
City of Lancaster

CERTIFICATION OF ORDINANCE
CITY COUNCIL

I, _____, _____ City of Lancaster, California, do hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of the original Ordinance No. , for which the original is on file in my office.

WITNESS MY HAND AND THE SEAL OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER, on this _____ day of the _____, _____.

_____
(seal)

**RESOLUTION NO. 12-22**

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 12-08

WHEREAS, a conditional use permit has been requested by Silverado Power, LLC, to allow the construction and operation of a 20 megawatt (MW) photovoltaic solar electric generating facility on approximately 135± gross acres generally bounded by Avenue G, Avenue H, 95th Street West, and 90th Street West in the Rural Residential 2.5 Zone as shown on the attached site plan; and

WHEREAS, an application for the above-described conditional use permit has been filed pursuant to the regulations contained in Article I of Chapter 17.32 and Chapter 17.42 of the Lancaster Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, a notice of intent to consider the granting of a Conditional Use Permit has been given as required in Article V of Chapter 17.32 of the Lancaster Municipal Code and in Section 65905 of the Government Code of the State of California; and

WHEREAS, staff has performed necessary investigations, prepared a written report, and recommended approval of this conditional use application, subject to conditions; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby certifies that it has reviewed and considered the information in the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the State Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act prior to taking action; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby finds, pursuant to Section 21082.1 of the Public Resource Code, that the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed project reflects the independent judgment of the City of Lancaster; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby finds that the Initial Study determined that the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment; however, there will not be a significant effect in this case with the implementation of mitigation measures as detailed in Exhibit "A"; and

WHEREAS, public notice was provided as required by law and a public hearing was held on September 17, 2012; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby adopts the following findings in support of approval of this application:

1. The proposed use would be located on 135± gross acres generally bounded by Avenue G, Avenue H, 95th Street West and 90th Street West and will be in conformance with the General Plan land use designation of Non-Urban Residential.

2. The proposed project is a 20 MW photovoltaic solar electric generation facility with a conditional use permit, which is consistent with General Plan Policy 3.6.6 that states,

"consider and promote the use of alternative energy such as wind energy and solar energy."

3. The requested use at the location proposed will not:

   a. Adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons living in the surrounding area because the proposed use will be screened from the surrounding residential uses by landscaping and the panels and trackers are silent.

   b. Be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site because City development standards will be met and any necessary parking is provided. The proposed panels are approximately 10 feet in height and would not exceed a maximum of 14 feet, which is under the maximum height regulations of the Rural Residential zones and are designed with adequate setbacks from the adjacent streets.

   c. Jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare because adequate water, drainage, and improvements will be part of the project.

4. The proposed use will not adversely affect nearby residents or school uses because the proposed use would be screened by landscaping, the maximum height of the panels are 14 feet, the panels and trackers are not noise generators, and there is limited vehicle traffic that would occur once construction has been completed.

5. The proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the photovoltaic solar electric generation facility, landscaping, and other development features prescribed in the Zoning Ordinance or as otherwise required in order to integrate said use with the use in the surrounding areas.

6. The proposed site is adequately served:

   a. By Avenue G and 90$^{th}$ Street West which are of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the anticipated daily vehicle trips such use would generate; and

   b. By other public and private service facilities, including water, fire, and police services as required and necessary for photovoltaic solar facilities.

7. The proposed use will not result in a significant effect on the environment because all potential impacts have been found to be less than significant with the inclusion of mitigation measures as noted in the environmental review section of the staff report prepared for this project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. This Commission hereby approves the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for this project with the finding that although the proposed Conditional Use Permit could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect on the environment after mitigation measures have been applied to the project.

2. This Commission hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Program, Exhibit "A".

3. This Commission hereby approves Conditional Use Permit No. 12-08, subject to the conditions attached hereto and incorporated herein.

PASSED, APPROVED and ADOPTED this 17th day of September 2012, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

JAMES D. VOSE, Chairman
Lancaster Planning Commission

ATTEST:

BRIAN S. LUDICKE, Planning Director
City of Lancaster

**ATTACHMENT TO PC RESOLUTION NO. 12-22**
**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 12-08**
**CONDITIONS LIST**
**September 17, 2012**

## GENERAL ADVISORY

1. All standard conditions as set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 10-23 shall apply, except Condition Nos. 47, 48, and 49.

2. Applicant shall comply with the requirements of California Sales and Use Tax Regulation 1699, subpart (h), Regulation 1699.6 and Regulation 1802, subparts (c) and (d), respectively, and shall cooperate with the City regarding their direct and indirect purchases and leases to ensure compliance with the above sections, including, if necessary, the formation and use of buying companies, and the direct reporting of purchases of over $500,000.

3. Per the direction of the Planning Director, no unscreened outdoor storage of any kind would be allowed on the site.

4. Per the direction of the Planning Director, barbed wire is acceptable on the top of the fence to provide site security, but not razor wire.

5. The applicant shall provide restroom facilities for use by maintenance staff.

## ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS

6. Per the direction of the Director of Public Works, dedicate the following right-of-way for streets:

    - Avenue G at 50 feet from centerline
    - 90th Street West at 50 feet from centerline
    - Avenue G-8 at 42 feet from centerline
    - 93rd Street West at 32 feet from centerline

7. Per the direction of the Director of Public Works, grant an irrevocable offer of dedication for the following street:

    - 95th Street West at 42 feet from centerline

8. Per the direction of the Director of Public Works, the applicant shall pave any driveway that takes access from any of the paved streets.

9. Per the direction of the Director of Public Works, the applicant shall obtain a right-of-way agreement for the generation-tie line from the project site to the Del Sur Substation.

10. Per the direction of the Planning Director, the applicant shall install a 10-foot wide landscaped planter along the perimeter of the project site for screening purposes.

11. Per the direction of the Director of Public Works, any public street surfaces damaged by construction traffic shall be restored to its pre-existing condition.

12. The applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City and its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the City or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul, an approval of the City concerning this conditional use permit and the use(s) and development permitted by its approval. The City shall promptly notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding and shall cooperate fully in the defense; this condition shall not be imposed if the City fails to promptly notify the applicant or fails to cooperate fully in the defense.

## MITIGATION MEASURES

13. A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities in accordance with established burrowing owl protocols. If burrowing owls or sign thereof are discovered during the survey, the applicant shall contact the California Department of Fish and Game to determine the appropriate mitigation/management requirements for the species.

14. A Swainson's hawk survey shall be conducted on the project site prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities in accordance with established Swainson's hawk protocols. If Swainson's hawks are identified using the project site during the survey, the applicant shall contact the California Department of Fish and Game to determine the appropriate mitigation/management requirements.

15. A Dust Control Plan in accordance with Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) Rule 403 shall be submitted prior to the start of grading/construction activities.

16. Prior to any demolition activities on Site 1, an asbestos survey shall be conducted to determine the presence or absence of asbestos and the results shall be submitted to the City of Lancaster. If asbestos containing materials are located, abatement of asbestos shall be completed prior to any demolition activities. Asbestos removal shall be performed by a State certified asbestos containment contractor in accordance with Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District Rule 1403.

17. Prior to any demolition activities on Site 1, a lead-based paint survey shall be conducted to determine the presence or absence of lead-based paint and the results shall be submitted to the City of Lancaster. If lead-based paint is located, abatement shall be completed prior to any demolition in accordance with California Code of Regulations Title 8, Section 1532.1.

18. In the event that the existing well(s) on the project sites will not be utilized during project operation or other wells are found on-site, the applicant shall abandon the wells in accordance with all existing rules and regulations.

19. Prior to the removal of the transformers located on the northern portion of Site 1, confirmation must be obtained as to the presence or absence of PCBs. In the event that PCBs are present, the transformers will be removed and disposed of in accordance with all rules and regulations.

20. Construction operations shall not occur between 8 p.m. and 7 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday or at any time on Sunday. The hours of any construction-related activities shall be restricted to periods and days permitted by local ordinance.

21. The on-site construction supervisor shall have the responsibility and authority to receive and resolve noise complaints. A clear appeal process to the owner shall be established prior to construction commencement that will allow for resolution of noise problems that cannot be immediately solved by the site supervisor.

22. Electrically powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, where feasible.

23. Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far away as practicable from noise-sensitive receptors.

24. The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells, shall be for safety warning purposes only.

25. No project-related public address or music system shall be audible at any adjacent receptor.

26. All noise producing construction equipment and vehicles using internal combustion engines shall be equipped with mufflers, air-inlet silencers where appropriate, and any other shrouds, shields, or other noise-reducing features in good operating condition that meet or exceed original factory specification. Mobile or fixed “package” equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors, etc.) shall be equipped with shrouds and noise control features that are readily available for the type of equipment.

# MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN (Exhibit A)
## Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 12-08

| Mit. / Cond. No. | Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval | Monitoring Milestone (Frequency) | Method of Verification | Party Responsible for Monitoring | VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Initials | Date | Remarks |
| BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES | | | | | | | |
| 1. | A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities. If burrowing owls or sign thereof are discovered during the survey, the applicant shall contact the Department of Fish and Game to determine the appropriate mitigation/management requirements for the species. | Prior to final approval of grading plan, issuance of a stockpile permit, or any ground disturbing activities. | Prior to vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpile, or construction, the City must receive a report from a biologist advising that the site is free of burrowing owls. | Planning Department responsible for reviewing report. | | | |
| 2. | A Swainson's hawk survey shall be conducted on the project site prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities in accordance with established Swainson's hawk protocols. If Swainson's hawks are identified using the project site during the survey, the applicant shall contact the California Department of Fish and Game to determine the appropriate mitigation/management requirements. | Prior to final approval of grading plan, issuance of a stockpile permit, or any ground disturbing activities. | Prior to vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpile, or construction, the City must receive a report from a biologist advising that the site is free of Swainson's hawk. | Planning Department responsible for reviewing report. | | | |
| GEOLOGY AND SOILS | | | | | | | |
| 3. | A Dust Control Plan in accordance with Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) Rule 403 shall be submitted prior to the start of grading/construction activities. | Prior to final approval of grading plan, issuance of a stockpile permit, or any ground disturbing activities. | Prior to vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpile, or construction, the City must receive a copy of the Dust Control Plan. | Planning Department/ Engineering responsible for reviewing report. | | | |

| Mit. / Cond. No. | Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval | Monitoring Milestone (Frequency) | Method of Verification | Party Responsible for Monitoring | VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Initials | Date | Remarks |
| HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS | | | | | | | |
| 4. | Prior to any demolition activities on Site 1, an asbestos survey shall be conducted to determine the presence or absence of asbestos and the results shall be submitted to the City of Lancaster. If asbestos containing-materials are located, abatement of asbestos shall be completed prior to any demolition activities. Asbestos removal shall be performed by a State certified asbestos containment contractor in accordance with Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District Rule 1403. | Prior to any demolition of the existing structures or issuance of a grading/building permit. | The City shall receive a report from a certified asbestos contractor detailing the results of the asbestos survey/ sampling and any abatement that was required. | Planning Department/ Engineering responsible for reviewing report. | | | |
| 5. | Prior to any demolition activities on Site 1, a lead-based paint survey shall be conducted to determine the presence or absence of lead-based paint and the results shall be submitted to the City of Lancaster. If lead-based paint is located, abatement shall be completed prior to any demolition in accordance with California Code of Regulations Title 8, Section 1532.1. | Prior to any demolition of the existing structures or issuance of a grading/building permit. | The City shall receive a report from a certified lead-based paint contractor detailing the results of the lead paint survey/ sampling and any abatement that was required. | Planning Department/ Engineering responsible for reviewing report. | | | |
| 6. | In the event that the existing well(s) on the project sites will not be utilized during project operation or other wells are found on-site, the applicant shall abandon the wells in accordance with all existing rules and regulations. | Prior to completion of construction activities. | The City shall receive a closure letter from the appropriate agency for each well that is abandoned. | Planning Department responsible for reviewing closure letter(s). | | | |
| 7. | Prior to the removal of the transformers located on the northern portion of Site 1, confirmation must be obtained as to the presence or absence of PCBs. In the event that PCBs are present, the transformers will be removed and disposed of in accordance with all rules and regulations. | Prior to the removal of any transformers from the project site. | The City shall receive a report documenting the presence or absence of PCBs in the transformer(s) onsite. If PCBs are determined to be present and the | Planning Department/ Engineering responsible for reviewing report. | | | |

| Mit. / Cond. No. | Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval | Monitoring Milestone (Frequency) | Method of Verification | Party Responsible for Monitoring | VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Initials | Date | Remarks |
| | | | transformer is removed, the report shall provide evidence of the PCBs proper disposal. | | | | |
| NOISE | | | | | | | |
| 8. | Construction operations shall not occur between 8 p.m. and 7 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday or at any time on Sunday. The hours of any construction-related activities shall be restricted to periods and days permitted by local ordinance. | During construction | Field inspection | Building and Safety | | | |
| 9. | The on-site construction supervisor shall have the responsibility and authority to receive and resolve noise complaints. A clear appeal process to the owner shall be established prior to construction commencement that will allow for resolution of noise problems that cannot be immediately solved by the site supervisor. | During construction | Field inspection | Building and Safety | | | |
| 10. | Electrically powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, where feasible. | During construction | Field inspection | Building and Safety | | | |
| 11. | Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far away as practicable from noise-sensitive receptors. | During construction | Field inspection | Building and Safety | | | |
| 12. | The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells, shall be for safety warning purposes only. | During construction | Field inspection | Building and Safety | | | |
| 13. | No project-related public address or music system shall be audible at any adjacent receptor. | During construction | Field inspection | Building and Safety | | | |
| 14. | All noise producing construction equipment and vehicles using internal combustion engines shall be | During construction | Field inspection | Building and Safety | | | |

| Mit. / Cond. No. | Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval | Monitoring Milestone (Frequency) | Method of Verification | Party Responsible for Monitoring | VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Initials | Date | Remarks |
| | equipped with mufflers, air-inlet silencers where appropriate, and any other shrouds, shields, or other noise-reducing features in good operating conditions that meet or exceed original factory specification. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors, etc.) shall be equipped with shrouds and noise control features that are readily available for the type of equipment. | | | | | | |

**RESOLUTION NO. 12-23**

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 12-09

WHEREAS, a conditional use permit has been requested by Silverado Power, LLC, to allow the construction and operation of a 40-megawatt (MW) photovoltaic solar electric generating facility on approximately 158± gross acres located at the southwest corner Avenue H and 100th Street West in the Rural Residential 2.5 Zone as shown on the attached site plan; and

WHEREAS, an application for the above-described conditional use permit has been filed pursuant to the regulations contained in Article I of Chapter 17.32 and Chapter 17.42 of the Lancaster Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, a notice of intent to consider the granting of a Conditional Use Permit has been given as required in Article V of Chapter 17.32 of the Lancaster Municipal Code and in Section 65905 of the Government Code of the State of California; and

WHEREAS, staff has performed necessary investigations, prepared a written report, and recommended approval of this conditional use application, subject to conditions; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby certifies that it has reviewed and considered the information in the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the State Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act prior to taking action; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby finds, pursuant to Section 21082.1 of the Public Resource Code, that the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed project reflects the independent judgment of the City of Lancaster; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby finds that the Initial Study determined that the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment; however, there will not be a significant effect in this case with the implementation of mitigation measures as detailed in Exhibit "B"; and

WHEREAS, public notice was provided as required by law and a public hearing was held on September 17, 2012; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby adopts the following findings in support of approval of this application:

1. The proposed use would be located on 158± gross acres at the southwest corner of Avenue H and 100th Street West and will be in conformance with the General Plan land use designation of Non-Urban Residential.

2. The proposed project is a 40 MW photovoltaic solar electric generation facility with a conditional use permit, which is consistent with General Plan Policy 3.6.6 that states,

"consider and promote the use of alternative energy such as wind energy and solar energy."

3. The requested use at the location proposed will not:

   a. Adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons living in the surrounding area because the proposed use will be screened from the surrounding residential uses by landscaping and the panels and trackers are silent.

   b. Be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site because City development standards will be met and any necessary parking is provided. The proposed panels are approximately 10 feet in height and would not exceed a maximum of 14 feet, which is under the maximum height regulations of the Rural Residential zones and are designed with adequate setbacks from the adjacent street.

   c. Jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare because adequate sewer, water, drainage, and improvements will be part of the project.

4. The proposed use will not adversely affect nearby residents because the proposed use would be screened by landscaping, the maximum height of the panels are 14 feet, the panels and trackers are not noise generators, and there is limited vehicle traffic that would occur once construction has been completed.

5. The proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the photovoltaic solar electric generation facility, landscaping, and other development features prescribed in the Zoning Ordinance or as otherwise required in order to integrate said use with the use in the surrounding areas.

6. The proposed site is adequately served:

   a. By a 30-foot paved access road from Avenue I to the project site entrance along future 100$^{th}$ Street West which would be of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the anticipated daily vehicle trips such use would generate. Alternately, the applicant would provide the 30-foot paved access road from 90$^{th}$ Street West via Avenue H; and

   b. By other public and private service facilities, including water, fire, and police services as required and necessary for photovoltaic solar facilities.

7. The proposed use will not result in a significant effect on the environment because all potential impacts have been found to be less than significant with the inclusion of mitigation measures as noted in the environmental review section of the staff report prepared for this project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. This Commission hereby approves the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for this project with the finding that although the proposed Conditional Use Permit could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect on the environment after mitigation measures have been applied to the project.

2. This Commission hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Program, Exhibit "B".

3. This Commission hereby approves Conditional Use Permit No. 12-09, subject to the conditions attached hereto and incorporated herein.

PASSED, APPROVED and ADOPTED this 17th day of September 2012, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

JAMES D. VOSE, Chairman
Lancaster Planning Commission

ATTEST:

BRIAN S. LUDICKE, Planning Director
City of Lancaster

**ATTACHMENT TO PC RESOLUTION NO. 12-23**
**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 12-09**
**CONDITIONS LIST**
**September 17, 2012**

## GENERAL ADVISORY

1. All standard conditions as set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 10-23 shall apply, except Condition Nos. 47, 48, and 49.

2. Applicant shall comply with the requirements of California Sales and Use Tax Regulation 1699, subpart (h), Regulation 1699.6 and Regulation 1802, subparts (c) and (d), respectively, and shall cooperate with the City regarding their direct and indirect purchases and leases to ensure compliance with the above sections, including, if necessary, the formation and use of buying companies, and the direct reporting of purchases of over $500,000.

3. Per the direction of the Planning Director, no unscreened outdoor storage of any kind would be allowed on the site.

4. Per the direction of the Planning Director, barbed wire is acceptable on the top of the fence to provide site security, but not razor wire.

5. The applicant shall provide restroom facilities for use by maintenance staff.

## ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS

6. Per the direction of the Director of Public Works, dedicate the following right-of-way for streets:

    - Avenue H at 50 feet from centerline
    - 100$^{th}$ Street West at 50 feet from centerline

7. Per the direction of the Director of Public Works, grant an irrevocable offer of dedication for the following streets:

    - Avenue H-8 at 42 feet from centerline
    - 105$^{th}$ Street West at 42 feet from centerline

8. Per the direction of the Director of Public Works, the applicant shall provide a 30-foot paved access road to the project site from Avenue I via 100$^{th}$ Street West. The applicant may alternately provide the 30-foot paved access road from 90$^{th}$ Street West via Avenue H. The applicant shall also acquire any right-of-way necessary for the improvements.

9. Per the direction of the Director of Public Works, the applicant shall pave any driveway that takes access from any of the paved streets.

10. Per the direction of the Director of Public Works, the applicant shall obtain a right-of-way agreement for the generation-tie line from the project site to the Central Antelope Dry Ranch C Substation.

11. Per the direction of the Planning Director, the applicant shall install a 10-foot wide landscaped planter along the perimeter of the project site for screening purposes.

12. Per the direction of the Director of Public Works, any public street surfaces damaged by construction traffic shall be restored to its pre-existing condition.

13. The applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City and its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the City or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul, an approval of the City concerning this conditional use permit and the use(s) and development permitted by its approval. The City shall promptly notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding and shall cooperate fully in the defense; this condition shall not be imposed if the City fails to promptly notify the applicant or fails to cooperate fully in the defense.

## MITIGATION MEASURES

14. Prior to the start of construction on Site 2, the access road to the project site shall be paved and operational.

15. A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities in accordance with established burrowing owl protocols. If burrowing owls or sign thereof are discovered during the survey, the applicant shall contact the California Department of Fish and Game to determine the appropriate mitigation/management requirements for the species.

16. A Swainson's hawk survey shall be conducted on the project site prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities in accordance with established Swainson's hawk protocols. If Swainson's hawks are identified using the project site during the survey, the applicant shall contact the California Department of Fish and Game to determine the appropriate mitigation/management requirements.

17. A Dust Control Plan in accordance with Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) Rule 403 shall be submitted prior to the start of grading/construction activities.

18. In the event that the existing well(s) on the project sites will not be utilized during project operation or other wells are found on-site, the applicant shall abandon the wells in accordance with all existing rules and regulations.

19. Construction operations shall not occur between 8 p.m. and 7 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday or at any time on Sunday. The hours of any construction-related activities shall be restricted to periods and days permitted by local ordinance.

20. The on-site construction supervisor shall have the responsibility and authority to receive and resolve noise complaints. A clear appeal process to the owner shall be established prior to construction commencement that will allow for resolution of noise problems that cannot be immediately solved by the site supervisor.

21. Electrically powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, where feasible.

22. Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far away as practicable from noise-sensitive receptors.

23. The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells, shall be for safety warning purposes only.

24. No project-related public address or music system shall be audible at any adjacent receptor.

25. All noise producing construction equipment and vehicles using internal combustion engines shall be equipped with mufflers, air-inlet silencers where appropriate, and any other shrouds, shields, or other noise-reducing features in good operating condition that meet or exceed original factory specification. Mobile or fixed “package” equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors, etc.) shall be equipped with shrouds and noise control features that are readily available for the type of equipment.

# MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN (Exhibit B)
## Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 12-09

| Mit. / Cond. No. | Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval | Monitoring Milestone (Frequency) | Method of Verification | Party Responsible for Monitoring | VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Initials | Date | Remarks |
| AIR QUALITY | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Prior to the start of construction on Site 2, the access road to the project site shall be paved and operational. | Prior to the final approval of a grading plan, issuance of a stockpile permit, or any ground disturbing activities. | Prior to vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpile, or construction, the City shall sign-off that the access road is constructed, paved, and operational. | Planning Department and Building and Safety. | | | |
| BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES | | | | | | | |
| 2. | A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities. If burrowing owls or sign thereof are discovered during the survey, the applicant shall contact the Department of Fish and Game to determine the appropriate mitigation/management requirements for the species. | Prior to final approval of grading plan, issuance of a stockpile permit, or any ground disturbing activities. | Prior to vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpile, or construction, the City must receive a report from a biologist advising that the site is free of burrowing owls. | Planning Department responsible for reviewing report. | | | |
| 3. | A Swainson's hawk survey shall be conducted on the project site prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities in accordance with established Swainson's hawk protocols. If Swainson's hawks are identified using the project site during the survey, the applicant shall contact the California Department of Fish and Game to determine the appropriate mitigation/management requirements. | Prior to final approval of grading plan, issuance of a stockpile permit, or any ground disturbing activities. | Prior to vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpile, or construction, the City must receive a report from a biologist advising that the site is free of Swainson's hawk. | Planning Department responsible for reviewing report. | | | |

| Mit. / Cond. No. | Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval | Monitoring Milestone (Frequency) | Method of Verification | Party Responsible for Monitoring | VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Initials | Date | Remarks |
| GEOLOGY AND SOILS | | | | | | | |
| 4. | A Dust Control Plan in accordance with Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) Rule 403 shall be submitted prior to the start of grading/construction activities. | Prior to final approval of grading plan, issuance of a stockpile permit, or any ground disturbing activities. | Prior to vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpile, or construction, the City must receive a copy of the Dust Control Plan. | Planning Department/ Engineering responsible for reviewing report. | | | |
| HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS | | | | | | | |
| 5. | In the event that the existing well(s) on the project sites will not be utilized during project operation or other wells are found on-site, the applicant shall abandon the wells in accordance with all existing rules and regulations. | Prior to the completion of construction activities. | The City shall receive a closure letter from the appropriate agency for each well that is abandoned. | Planning Department responsible for review closure letter(s). | | | |
| NOISE | | | | | | | |
| 6. | Construction operations shall not occur between 8 p.m. and 7 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday or at any time on Sunday. The hours of any construction-related activities shall be restricted to periods and days permitted by local ordinance. | During construction | Field inspection | Building and Safety | | | |
| 7. | The on-site construction supervisor shall have the responsibility and authority to receive and resolve noise complaints. A clear appeal process to the owner shall be established prior to construction commencement that will allow for resolution of noise problems that cannot be immediately solved by the site supervisor. | During construction | Field inspection | Building and Safety | | | |
| 8. | Electrically powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, where feasible. | During construction | Field inspection | Building and Safety | | | |

| Mit. / Cond. No. | Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval | Monitoring Milestone (Frequency) | Method of Verification | Party Responsible for Monitoring | VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Initials | Date | Remarks |
| 9. | Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far away as practicable from noise-sensitive receptors. | During construction | Field inspection | Building and Safety | | | |
| 10. | The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells, shall be for safety warning purposes only. | During construction | Field inspection | Building and Safety | | | |
| 11. | No project-related public address or music system shall be audible at any adjacent receptor. | During construction | Field inspection | Building and Safety | | | |
| 12. | All noise producing construction equipment and vehicles using internal combustion engines shall be equipped with mufflers, air-inlet silencers where appropriate, and any other shrouds, shields, or other noise-reducing features in good operating conditions that meet or exceed original factory specification. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors, etc.) shall be equipped with shrouds and noise control features that are readily available for the type of equipment. | During construction | Field inspection | Building and Safety | | | |

CITY OF LANCASTER
REVISED INITIAL STUDY

1. Project title and File Number: Conditional Use Permit 12-08
Conditional Use Permit 12-09
Development Agreement 89-01
General Plan Amendment 12-02
Zone Change 12-02

2. Lead agency name and address: City of Lancaster
Planning Department
44933 Fern Avenue
Lancaster, California 93534

3. Contact person and phone number: Jocelyn Swain
(661) 723-6100

4. Applicant name and address: Silverado Power
John Cheney/Jim Howell
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3065
San Francisco, CA 94104

5. Location: A total of ±293 acres divided between two sites:

- Site 1: ±135 acres generally bounded by 90th Street West, Avenue H, Avenue G, and 95th Street West (CUP 12-08)
- Site 2: ±158 acres bounded by Avenue H, 100th Street West, Avenue H-8, and 105th Street West (CUP 12-09)

6. General Plan designation: The General Plan designations for each site are as follows:

- Site 1: Current – Urban Residential (UR) and NU (Non-Urban Residential); Proposed – NU
- Site 2: Current – UR; Proposed - NU

7. Zoning: The zoning for each site is as follows:

- Site 1: Current – R-7,000 (single family residential, minimum lot size 7,000 square feet), R-10,000 (single family residential, minimum lot size 10,000 square feet), RR-2.5 (Rural Residential, minimum lot size 2.5 acres); Proposed – RR-2.5
- Site 2: Current – R-7,000 and R-10,000; Proposed – RR2.5

8. Description of project:

The following describes the proposed activities at each of the project sites.

**Site 1**

The proposed project is a 20 megawatt (MW), photovoltaic solar electric generating facility located on approximately 135 acres agricultural land (58 acres of previously disturbed, fallow agricultural fields; 77 acres of active agricultural fields) in the City of Lancaster. The proposed project would employ photovoltaic (PV) modules that convert sunlight into electrical energy without use of heat transfer fluid or cooling water. The facility would include a 66 kilovolt (kV) generation-tie (gen-tie) line for interconnecting the electrical output of the proposed project to the regional transmission system. This line would connect the project site to the Del Sur Substation at the southeast corner of 90th Street West and Avenue H.

The proposed project would be constructed in phases and operated for a period of 35 years. The project facilities would operate year round, producing power during daytime hours. It is anticipated that the site preparation and construction would start in 2013 with construction completed and the facility operational by the last quarter of 2013 or the first half of 2014. The proposed project consists of the following elements: PV modules; module mounting system; balance of system and electrical boxes (e.g., combiner boxes, electrical disconnects); electrical inverters and transformers; electrical AC collection system, including switch gear; data monitoring equipment; and access roads and security fencing.

A series of PV module arrays would be mounted on racking systems typically supported by a pile-driven foundation design. The module mounting system or racking system would be a fixed tilt or tracker PV array configuration oriented due south to maximize the amount of incidental solar radiation absorbed over the course of the year.

Electrical connections from a series of PV arrays would be channeled to combiner boxes located throughout the solar field. Electrical current would be collected and combined prior to feeding the inverters. The solar field would be laid out in a common PV block design to allow adequate clearance and access roads and adequate access for maintenance. The AC output from the inverters would be routed through an AC collection system and consolidated within system switchgear. The final output from the proposed project would be processed through a transformer to match the interconnection voltage. Electrical safety and protection systems would be provided to meet utility, CAISO (California Independent System Operator) and regulatory codes and standards. The energy would be delivered to the Southern California Edison (SCE) transmission network.

A security perimeter fence with appropriate signage for public protection would be installed. Points of ingress/egress would be accessed by locked gates for facility services and maintenance as required. 10 feet of landscaping would be provided between the edge of the right-of-way and the fencing.

Photovoltaic Modules

The specific technology has not been determined yet but would include one of the following: PV thin-film technology, PV crystalline silicon technology, stationary fixed-tilt modular configuration, and tracking module configuration. For the tracking configuration, the modules would rotate from east to west over the course of the day. Modules would be non-reflective and highly absorptive.

Standard Installation, Array Assembly, and Racking

There are a variety of module mounting systems from various manufacturers that are available. The majority can be mounted on a variety of foundations. Fixed-tilt, single-axis trackers, and dual axis trackers provide various levels of energy efficiencies. These systems are under consideration for the proposed project. The module mounting system provides the structure that supports the PV module arrays. The foundations are typically cylindrical steel pipes, pile driven into the soil using pneumatic techniques, similar to hydraulic pile driving. Once the foundation has been installed, the module racking system would be installed to support the PV modules. For a tracking configuration, motors would be installed to drive the tracking mechanism. The module mounting system would be oriented in rows within a PV design block reflecting a standard and uniform appearance across the facility. The module configuration would be uniform in height and width.

DC Collection, Inverters, AC Collection, and Transformers

Modules would be electrically connected into strings. Each string would be funneled by electrical conduit underground to combiner boxes located throughout the solar field power blocks. The output power cables from the combiner boxes would be again consolidated and feed the DC electricity to inverters which convert the DC to AC. System transformers would step up the AC power to the appropriate interconnection voltage. As required, switchgear cabinetry would be provided where necessary for circuit control.

All electrical inverters, transformers, and gear would be placed on concrete foundation structures. The proposed project, including inverter equipment, would be designed and laid out in MW increments/blocks. Each inverter would be fully enclosed; pad-mounted, and stand approximately 90 inches (7.5 feet) in height. The AC output of two inverters would be fed via underground cable into the low-voltage side of the inverter step-up transformer, generally within 20 feet of the inverters.

Substation

The substation area would be excavated for the transformer equipment, control building foundation, and oil containment area. Reinforced concrete would be used for foundations. Structural components in the substation area include the following: transformers, switchgear and safety systems; and footings and oil containment system for the transformers.

The transformers would be approximately 87 inches in height and would be pad mounted and enclosed together with switchgear and a junction box. The high-voltage output of the transformer would be combined in series via underground collector cable to the junction box of the transformer in closest proximity. Distances can range from a little as 60 feet to as much as 700 feet throughout the project site. The collector system cables would be tied at underground junction boxes to the main underground collector cables composed of a larger gauge wire, to the location of the generator step-up transformer (GSU). The main collector cables would rise into the low-voltage busbar and protection equipment that is enclosed together with the GSU. The primary switchgear includes the main circuit breaker and utility metering equipment, and would be enclosed separately and pad mounted together with the GSU. Both the GSU and the primary switchgear stand approximately 87 inches in height. The output of the switchgear would be the start of the gen-tie. The three-phase gen-tie would be composed of an overhead conductor and a disconnect switch on 55-foot wooden poles.

Data Collection System

The proposed project would be designed with a comprehensive Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system for remote monitoring of facility operation and/or remote control of critical components. The system would also include a meteorological (met) data collection system with the following weather sensors: a pyranometer for measuring solar irradiance, a thermometer to measure air temperature, a barometric pressure sensor to measure atmospheric pressure and two wind sensors to measure speed and direction.

Interconnection Plan and Generation-Tie Lines

Electricity would be delivered to the existing SCE Del Sur Substation via a generation tie line originating at the DC collection system within the project site.

## Project Construction

Project construction would consist of three phases: 1) site preparation; 2) PV system installation, testing and start up; and 3) site cleanup/restoration.

Site Preparation

Construction of the PV facility would begin with initial clearing and grading of the staging areas. The staging area would typically include construction offices, a first aid station and other temporary buildings, worker parking, truck loading and unloading facilities, and an area for assembly. Road corridors would be surveyed, cleared, and graded to bring equipment, materials, and workers to the areas under construction. Buried electrical lines, PV array locations, and the locations of other facilities may be flagged and staked to guide construction activities. The project site would be fenced with security fencing.

PV System Installation

PV system installation would include earthwork, grading, and erosion control, as well as construction of the plant substation and erection of PV modules, supports, and associated electrical equipment. System installation would begin with teams installing the mounting and steel/concrete pier support structures. The methods may include, but are not limited to, vibration driven screw piles or above ground ballast foundations. This would be followed by panel installation and electrical work.

Concrete would be required for the footings, foundations, and pads for the transformers and substation equipment. Concrete would be produced at an off-site location by a local provider and transported to the project site by truck. The enclosures housing the inverters would have a pre-cast concrete base.

The PV modules require a moderately flat surface for installation. Some earthwork, including grading, fill, compaction, and erosion control cultivation may be required to accommodate the placement of PV arrays, foundations or footings, access roads, and drainage features. Control of erosion during construction may include the use of silt fencing, straw bales and temporary catch basins, inlet filters and truck tire muck shakers. Construction of the PV arrays would include installation support beams, module rail assemblies, PV modules, inverters, transformers, and buried electrical cables.

Construction Workers, Hours, and Equipment

The construction activities are expected to be completed in approximately 9 months. Construction would generally occur during daylight hours, Monday through Friday. Weekend and non-daylight hours may be necessary to make up schedule deficiencies or to complete critical construction activities. Construction activities would be conducted consistent with City of Lancaster regulations regarding hours of construction. The project would generate a peak of approximately 100 new jobs during the construction phase.

**Project Operation and Maintenance**

For the duration of the operational phase, the proposed project would be operated on an unstaffed basis and monitored remotely, with regular on-site personnel visitations for security, maintenance, and system monitoring. There would be no full-time site personnel on-site during operation. As the proposed project's PV arrays produce electricity passively with minimal moving parts, maintenance requirements would be limited. Any required planned maintenance would be scheduled to avoid peak load periods and unplanned maintenance would be typically responded to as needed depending on the event. An inventory of spare components would be readily available from a remote warehouse facility.

**Site 2**

The proposed project is a 40 megawatt (MW), photovoltaic solar electric generating facility located on approximately 158 acres of previously disturbed agricultural land in the City of Lancaster. The proposed project would employ photovoltaic (PV) modules that convert sunlight into electrical energy without use of heat transfer fluid or cooling water. The facility would include a 66 kilovolt (kV) generation-tie (gen-tie) line for interconnecting the electrical output of the proposed project to the regional transmission system. This line would connect the project site to Silverado's Central Antelope Dry Ranch Substation near the corner of 97$^{th}$ Street West and Lancaster Boulevard.

The proposed project would be constructed in phases and operated for a period of 35 years. The project facilities would operate year round, producing power during daytime hours. It is anticipated that the site preparation and construction would start in 2013 with construction completed and the facility operational by the last quarter of 2013 or the first half of 2014. The proposed project consists of the following elements: PV modules; module mounting system; balance of system and electrical boxes (e.g., combiner boxes, electrical disconnects); electrical inverters and transformers; electrical AC collection system, including switch gear; data monitoring equipment; and access roads and security fencing.

A series of PV module arrays would be mounted on racking systems typically supported by a pile-driven foundation design. The module mounting system or racking system would be a fixed tilt or tracker PV array configuration oriented due south to maximize the amount of incidental solar radiation absorbed over the course of the year.

Electrical connections from a series of PV arrays would be channeled to combiner boxes located throughout the solar field. Electrical current would be collected and combined prior to feeding the inverters. The solar field would be laid out in a common PV block design to allow adequate clearance and access roads and adequate access for maintenance. The AC output from the inverters would be routed through an AC collection system and consolidated within system switchgear. The final output from the proposed project would be processed through a transformer to match the interconnection voltage. Electrical safety and protection systems would be provided to meet utility, CAISO (California

Independent System Operator) and regulatory codes and standards. The energy would be delivered to the Southern California Edison (SCE) transmission network.

A security perimeter fence with appropriate signage for public protection would be installed. Points of ingress/egress would be accessed by locked gates for facility services and maintenance as required. 10 feet of landscaping would be provided between the edge of the right-of-way and the fencing.

Photovoltaic Modules

The specific technology has not been determined yet but would include one of the following: PV thin-film technology, PV crystalline silicon technology, stationary fixed-tilt modular configuration, and tracking module configuration. For the tracking configuration, the modules would rotate from east to west over the course of the day. Modules would be non-reflective and highly absorptive.

Standard Installation, Array Assembly, and Racking

There are a variety of module mounting systems from various manufacturers that are available. The majority can be mounted on a variety of foundations. Fixed-tilt, single-axis trackers, and dual axis trackers provide various levels of energy efficiencies. These systems are under consideration for the proposed project. The module mounting system provides the structure that supports the PV module arrays. The foundations are typically cylindrical steel pipes, pile driven into the soil using pneumatic techniques, similar to hydraulic pile driving. Once the foundation has been installed, the module racking system would be installed to support the PV modules. For a tracking configuration, motors would be installed to drive the tracking mechanism. The module mounting system would be oriented in rows within a PV design block reflecting a standard and uniform appearance across the facility. The module configuration would be uniform in height and width.

DC Collection, Inverters, AC Collection, and Transformers

Modules would be electrically connected into strings. Each string would be funneled by electrical conduit underground to combiner boxes located throughout the solar field power blocks. The output power cables from the combiner boxes would be again consolidated and feed the DC electricity to inverters which convert the DC to AC. System transformers would step up the AC power to the appropriate interconnection voltage. As required, switchgear cabinetry would be provided where necessary for circuit control.

All electrical inverters, transformers, and gear would be placed on concrete foundation structures. The proposed project, including inverter equipment, would be designed and laid out in MW increments/blocks. Each inverter would be fully enclosed; pad-mounted, and stand approximately 90 inches (7.5 feet) in height. The AC output of two inverters would be fed via underground cable into the low-voltage side of the inverter step-up transformer, generally within 20 feet of the inverters.

Substation

The substation area would be excavated for the transformer equipment, control building foundation, and oil containment area. Reinforced concrete would be used for foundations. Structural components in the substation area include the following: transformers, switchgear and safety systems; and footings and oil containment system for the transformers.

The transformers would be approximately 87 inches in height and would be pad mounted and enclosed together with switchgear and a junction box. The high-voltage output of the transformer would be combined in series via underground collector cable to the junction box of the transformer in closest proximity. Distances can range from a little as 60 feet to as much as 700 feet throughout the project site. The collector system cables would be tied at underground junction boxes to the main underground collector cables composed of a larger gauge wire, to the location of the generator step-up transformer (GSU). The main collector cables would rise into the low-voltage busbar and protection equipment that is enclosed together with the GSU. The primary switchgear includes the main circuit breaker and utility metering equipment, and would be enclosed separately and pad mounted together with the GSU. Both the GSU and the primary switchgear stand approximately 87 inches in height. The output of the switchgear would be the start of the gen-tie. The three-phase gen-tie would be composed of an overhead conductor and a disconnect switch on 55-foot wooden poles.

Data Collection System

The proposed project would be designed with a comprehensive Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system for remote monitoring of facility operation and/or remote control of critical components. The system would also include a meteorological (met) data collection system with the following weather sensors: a pyranometer for measuring solar irradiance, a thermometer to measure air temperature, a barometric pressure sensor to measure atmospheric pressure and two wind sensors to measure speed and direction.

Interconnection Plan and Generation-Tie Lines

Electricity would be delivered to Silverado's Central Antelope Dry Ranch Substation near the corner of 97$^{th}$ Street West and Lancaster Boulevard.

**Project Construction**

Project construction would consist of three phases: 1) site preparation; 2) PV system installation, testing and start up; and 3) site cleanup/restoration.

Site Preparation

Construction of the PV facility would begin with initial clearing and grading of the staging areas. The staging area would typically include construction offices, a first aid station and other temporary buildings, worker parking, truck loading and unloading facilities, and an area for assembly. Road corridors would be surveyed, cleared, and graded to bring equipment, materials, and workers to the areas under construction. Buried electrical lines, PV array locations, and the locations of other facilities may be flagged and staked to guide construction activities. The project site would be fenced with security fencing.

PV System Installation

PV system installation would include earthwork, grading, and erosion control, as well as construction of the plant substation and erection of PV modules, supports, and associated electrical equipment. System installation would begin with teams installing the mounting and steel/concrete pier support structures. The methods may include, but are not limited to, vibration driven screw piles or above ground ballast foundations. This would be followed by panel installation and electrical work.

Concrete would be required for the footings, foundations, and pads for the transformers and substation equipment. Concrete would be produced at an off-site location by a local provider and transported to the project site by truck. The enclosures housing the inverters would have a pre-cast concrete base.

The PV modules require a moderately flat surface for installation. Some earthwork, including grading, fill, compaction, and erosion control cultivation may be required to accommodate the placement of PV arrays, foundations or footings, access roads, and drainage features. Control of erosion during construction may include the use of silt fencing, straw bales and temporary catch basins, inlet filters and truck tire muck shakers. Construction of the PV arrays would include installation support beams, module rail assemblies, PV modules, inverters, transformers, and buried electrical cables.

Construction Workers, Hours, and Equipment

The construction activities are expected to be completed in approximately 9 months. Construction would generally occur during daylight hours, Monday through Friday. Weekend and non-daylight hours may be necessary to make up schedule deficiencies or to complete critical construction activities. Construction activities would be conducted consistent with City of Lancaster regulations regarding hours of construction. The project would generate a peak of approximately 150 new jobs during the construction phase.

**Project Operation and Maintenance**

For the duration of the operational phase, the proposed project would be operated on an unstaffed basis and monitored remotely, with regular on-site personnel visitations for security, maintenance, and system monitoring. There would be no full-time site personnel on-site during operation. As the proposed project's PV arrays produce electricity passively with minimal moving parts, maintenance requirements would be limited. Any required planned maintenance would be scheduled to avoid peak load periods and unplanned maintenance would be typically responded to as needed depending on the event. An inventory of spare components would be readily available from a remote warehouse facility.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The area surrounding Site 1 is predominantly vacant land consisting of a mix of agricultural uses, school uses, some single family residences/ranches, and open desert. Site 1 consists of a northern half of 77 acres and a southern half of 58 acres connected at the southeast and northwest corners, respectively. The land surrounding the northern half of Site 1 is vacant with the exception of three single family residences located to the east along Avenue G. The property to the east, northeast and some of the property to the north is located in the unincorporated County. The remainder of the property is located within the City of Lancaster. The property to the east is zoned A-2-1 (Heavy Agricultural, 1 acre minimum lot size). The property to the northeast and some of the property to the north is zoned A-1-1 (Light Agricultural, 1 acre minimum lot size). The remainder of the property to the north is zoned P (Public Use) and zoned S (School). The property to the west is UR and zoned R-10,000. The property to the south is designated UR and zoned a mix of R-10,000 and R-7,000.

The property surrounding the southern half of Site 1 consists of school uses, active agricultural uses, and open desert. The property to the north and a small portion of the property to the south is located in the unincorporated county, is vacant, zoned A-2-1. The remainder of the property to the south is developed with Del Sur Elementary School and is designated P and zoned S. The property to the east contains an

active agricultural use (alfalfa fields and vineyards), designated NU and zoned RR-2.5. The property to the west is open desert, designated UR and zoned a mix of R-10,000 and R-7,000.

The property surrounding Site 2 is vacant land consisting of a mix of former agricultural fields and open desert. There are no residential uses immediate adjacent to the project site. A single family residence is located approximately 0.25 miles to the northeast, a couple of single family residences are located approximately 0.25 miles to the east, and several single family residences are located approximately 0.5 miles to the south. The property to the north is designated UR and Commercial (C) and zoned R-7,000 and Commercial Planned Development (CPD). The property to the east is designated NU and zoned RR-2.5. The property to the south and west is located in the unincorporated County and zoned A-1-1 (Light Agriculture, 1 acre minimum).

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

Approvals from other public agencies for the proposed project include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (dust control plan)
- Southern California Edison

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| _____ Aesthetics | _____ Agriculture and Forest Resources | _____ Air Quality |
| _____ Biological Resources | _____ Cultural Resources | _____ Geology/Soils |
| _____ Greenhouse Gas Emissions | _____ Hazards & Hazardous Materials | _____ Hydrology/Water Quality |
| _____ Land Use/Planning | _____ Mineral Resources | _____ Noise |
| _____ Population/Housing | _____ Public Services | _____ Recreation |
| _____ Transportation/Traffic | _____ Utilities/Service Systems | _____ Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION - On the basis of this initial evaluation:

_____ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared:

__X__ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

_____ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

_____ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

_____ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in a earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicant standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Jocelyn Swain, Associate Planner - Environmental

8/14/12
Date

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" 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) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially 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 (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c) Mitigation measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated", describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

   a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

   b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | 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 AND FOREST 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 prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project: | | | | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 non-agricultural use? | | | X | |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | | | X | |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526)? | | | | X |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | | | | X |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest 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 | | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | | | X | |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | | | X | |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | | | X | |
| 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, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | | | | X |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 or 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 |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, 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. | | | | 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 disposal of waste water? | | | | X |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | | | X | |
| b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | | | X | |
| VIII. 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 fore-seeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | | X | | |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle 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 §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 |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | 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 | |
| IX. 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 pre-existing 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, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | | | X | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | 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? | | | X | |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems? | | | X | |
| f) 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 |
| g) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | | | X | |
| h) 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 |
| i) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | | | | X |
| X. 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 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? | | | X | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan? | | | | X |
| XI. 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 |
| XII 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 noise 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 |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project: | | | | |
| 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)? | | | | X |
| 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 |
| XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES | | | | |
| 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 |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Other public facilities? | | | | X |
| XV. 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 |
| XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | | | X | |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards 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 |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | | | | X |
| XVII. 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 resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | | | X | |
| e) Have 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 | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | | |

DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

I. a. Views of two scenic areas are available from the roadways and areas surrounding the project sites as identified by the General Plan (LMEA Figure 12-1). These scenic areas include views of the Foothill Area (Scenic Area 1) and Quartz Hill (Scenic Area 3). The Antelope Valley California Poppy Reserve is also distantly located to the west of the project sites. Additionally, 90th Street West has been designated by the City's General Plan as a Scenic Route from Avenue K to the Los Angeles/Kern County line (Avenue A).

With implementation of the proposed projects, the available views of the identified scenic resources would not change and would continue to be available from the roadways and areas surrounding the project sites. The change in the project sites would be visible; however, the project sites would be fenced and screened with 10 feet of landscaping along the entire perimeter. The height of the PV panels would be approximately 10 feet and would not exceed a maximum of 14 feet which is substantially lower than the height of the 696 single family homes that are currently approved for 216 of the 293 acres being considered for the proposed projects. The height of the developments would not impede the views of the mountains to the north and south while traveling on 90th Street West. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b. The proposed projects would not remove any scenic resources such as rock outcroppings or trees. The southern half of Site 1 and Site 2 do not contain any buildings (historic or otherwise). The northern half of Site 1 contains a farm house complex. The oldest building in this complex was probably built around 1939 and has been subsequently modified. Construction on Site 1 would remove this farm complex. However, as described in Section Va-d., these buildings are not considered significant cultural resources. Additionally, the project sites are not located in the vicinity of any State Scenic Highways. 90th Street West has been designated by the City's General Plan as a scenic route from Avenue K to the Los Angeles/Kern County line (Avenue A); however, the proposed projects would not change the available views that make the roadway scenic (long range views of the mountains). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c. The proposed projects would change the visual character of the project sites in that they would replace fallow and active agricultural fields with photovoltaic solar electric generating facilities. While this would change the character of the existing sites, the proposed projects would be compatible with the other uses in the area. Specifically, the proposed projects would be compatible with the large-scale transmission lines in the area, the Southern California Edison Substations on the southeast corner of Avenue H and 90th Street West (Del Sur Substation) and Avenue J and 90th Street West (Antelope Substation), the approved solar facilities on the southwest and southeast corners of 90th Street West and Avenue H, and the approved solar facility immediately adjacent to the east of Site 2. The height of the PV panels is estimated at approximately 10 feet and would not exceed 14 feet. The inverters and transformers on the project sites would be approximately 7.5 feet in height. This is less than the height of a single family residence and would be less noticeable than the 696 single family residences which are currently approved for 216 of the 293 acres that make up the project sites. The proposed projects would be fenced and 10-feet of landscaping would be provided around the entire perimeter. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d. The proposed projects would create new sources of light. The area surrounding Site 1 currently has minimal sources of light. The sources are primarily from the SCE Del Sur Substation, Del Sur Elementary School, and a scattering of single family homes/ranches in the area, primarily near the northern portion of the project site along Avenue G. The area near Site 2 has no immediately adjacent sources of light; however, light from single family residences in the vicinity is distantly visible. Additionally, a solar farm is under construction immediately east of Site 2 which will generate some light once it is operational (security/perimeter lighting). This lighting would be shielded and focused downward onto the sites. No sources of glare are anticipated from the projects as the PV panels are designed to absorb sunlight, no reflect it. Any structures on the projects sites would be constructed from non-reflective materials to the extent feasible. Therefore, light and glare impacts would be less than significant.

II. a. The California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), tracks and categorizes land with respect to agricultural resources. Land is designated as one of the following and each has a specific definition: Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance, Grazing Land, Urban and Built-Up Land, and Other Land.

The Los Angeles County Farmland Map was updated in 2010. On the 2010 map, the southern half of Site 1 (58 acres) is designated as primarily "Other Land" with a small strip of land on the western boundary designated as "Grazing Land". The northern half of Site 1 (77 acres) is designated as "Prime Farmland". Site 2 is designated as "Grazing Land".

Other Land is defined as "land not included in any other mapping category. Common examples include low density rural developments; brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing; confined livestock, poultry, or aquaculture facilities; strip mines, borrow pits; and water bodies smaller than 40 acres." Grazing Land is defined as "land on which the existing vegetation is suited to the grazing of livestock". "Prime Farmland" is defined as "...the best combination of physical and chemical features able to sustain long-term agricultural production. This land has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields. Land must have been used for irrigated agricultural production at some time during the four years prior to the mapping date." (CDC 2004)

The southern half of Site 1 and all of Site 2 are not designated as farmland of importance by the State nor are they currently utilized for agricultural purposes. Therefore, no impacts to agricultural resources would occur in these areas. The northern half of Site 1 is currently under agricultural production with alfalfa and is designated as Prime Farmland. According to the 2010 Farmland Map, Los Angeles County has 30,876 acres of Prime Farmland. Removal of the 58 acres of Prime Farmland would reduce the total acres by .19%. This is a minimal amount of farmland.

The Antelope Valley Ground Water Basin is currently undergoing adjudication. It has been estimated that between 170,000 and 180,000 acre feet of water are pumped every year from the groundwater basin. The sustainable yield has been determined to be 110,000 acre feet. This is a minimum reduction in available groundwater of 60,000 acre feet a year. As a result, uses that require substantial amounts of water, such as alfalfa farming, may no longer be economically viable. Additionally, use of the project for a solar generating facility would not prevent the site from being utilized for agricultural purposes in the future. Therefore, impacts to agricultural resources would be less than significant.

b. The City of Lancaster does not have agricultural zone. However, the RR-1 and RR-2.5 zonings do allow for agricultural production to occur. The proposed project would change the zoning on the southern half of Site 1 and all of Site 2 to RR-2.5. The northern half of Site 1 is already RR-2.5. The proposed developments would not impact any of the surrounding agricultural uses or prevent the sites from being used for agricultural purposes in the future. Additional, neither site is under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c-d. According to the City of Lancaster's General Plan, there are no forests or timberlands located within the City of Lancaster. Therefore, the proposed projects would not result in the rezoning of forest or timberland and would not cause the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest land. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

e. See response to Items IIa-d.

III. a. Development proposed under the City's General Plan would not create air emissions that exceed the Air Quality Management Plan (GPEIR pgs 5.5-21 to 5.5-22). The proposed projects consist of the construction and operation of photovoltaic solar electric generating facilities. The proposed projects were not accounted for under the City's General Plan as all of Site 2 and 58 acres of the 135 acres on Site 1 are currently designated and zoned for urban residential uses and Tentative Tract Map (TTM) 46250 has been approved for 696 single family residences on these areas. The applicant is seeking a General Plan Amendment (GPA) and Zone Change (ZC) to change the General Plan designation to Non-Urban Residential (NU) and the zoning to RR-2.5 which would allow the construction of the proposed projects with Conditional Use Permits (CUPs). This is a substantially less intensive use than the approved single family residences. The remaining 77 acres of Site 1 are currently designated as NU and zoned RR-2.5. Therefore, any air emissions generated by the proposed projects have already been accounted for and the proposed projects would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan and no impacts would occur.

b. The air emissions associated with the construction and operation of the proposed projects were estimated utilizing the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), version 2011.1.1. This model was developed in cooperation with the South Coast Air Quality Management District and other air districts throughout the State and was designed as a uniform platform to quantify potential criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions associated with construction and operation of various land uses. The results of this analysis were documented in two technical reports prepared for the proposed projects by Michael Brandman Associates entitled "Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Report, Summer Solar Generating Facility Project, City of Lancaster, California" (Site 1), dated July 25, 2012 and "Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Report, Springtime Solar Generating Facility Project, City of Lancaster, California" (Site 2), dated August 3, 2012.

The project sites are within the boundaries of the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) and therefore, the projects' estimated air emissions were compared to the thresholds established by the AVAQMD. These thresholds were provided in AVAQMD's *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Federal Conformity Guidelines* document, dated 2011. These thresholds have been summarized below in Table 1.

**Table 1**
**AVAQMD's Significance Thresholds**

| Criteria Pollutant | Daily Threshold (pounds) | Annual Threshold (tons) |
|---|---|---|
| Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) | 137 | 25 |
| Oxides of Nitrogen ($NO_x$) | 137 | 25 |
| Carbon Monoxide | 548 | 100 |
| Oxides of Sulfur ($SO_x$) | 138 | 25 |
| Particulate Matter ($PM_{10}$) | 82 | 15 |
| Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$) | 82 | 15 |

Site 1

Air emissions associated with the construction of the proposed project were calculated and compared to the AVAQMD thresholds. These emissions were generated using information such as number of days

for particular activities (e.g., demolition, grading, etc.) and the number and types of equipment necessary. These emissions are shown in Tables 2 and 3, below. As can be seen from the tables, emissions would be less than the AVAQMD thresholds and therefore, construction emissions for Site 1 would be less than significant.

**Table 2**
**Construction Air Pollutant Daily Emissions**

| Source | Emissions (pounds per day) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | VOC | $NO_x$ | CO | $SO_x$ | $PM_{10}$ | $PM_{2.5}$ |
| Demolition | 4.0 | 33.8 | 18.1 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 1.4 |
| Mass Grading | 8.7 | 71.7 | 38.7 | 0.1 | 11.9 | 6.5 |
| Fine Grading | 2.8 | 22.3 | 12.1 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 1.0 |
| Trenching | 2.6 | 16.1 | 12.9 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 1.3 |
| PV Installation | 3.4 | 24.2 | 22.5 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 1.2 |
| **Maximum Daily Emissions** | **8.7** | **71.7** | **38.7** | **0.1** | **11.9** | **6.5** |
| Significance Threshold | 137 | 137 | 548 | 137 | 82 | 82 |
| Significant Impact | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Notes: The maximum daily emissions refer to the maximum emissions that would occur in one day; it was assumed that the grading activities do not occur at the same time as the other construction activities; therefore, their emissions are not summed | | | | | | |

**Table 3**
**Construction Air Pollutant Annual Emissions**

| Source | Emissions (tons per year) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | VOC | $NO_x$ | CO | $SO_x$ | $PM_{10}$ | $PM_{2.5}$ |
| Demolition | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.02 | <0.01 |
| Mass Grading | 0.09 | 0.72 | 0.39 | <0.01 | 0.12 | 0.07 |
| Fine Grading | 0.03 | 0.22 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| Trenching | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| PV Installation | 0.26 | 1.82 | 1.69 | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.09 |
| **Maximum Daily Emissions** | **0.42** | **3.02** | **2.38** | **<0.01** | **0.44** | **0.18** |
| Significance Threshold | 25 | 25 | 100 | 25 | 15 | 15 |
| Significant Impact | No | No | No | No | No | No |

Operational air pollutant emissions are shown in Table 4 (daily) and Table 5 (annual). As shown in these tables, the emissions do not exceed the AVAQMD's significance thresholds. Additionally, the proposed project would result in fewer air emissions on a daily and annual basis than the current conditions (fallow and active agricultural fields) and ultimately would result in a reduction in air pollutants. Therefore, operational impacts on Site 1 would be less than significant.

**Table 4**
**Operational Air Pollutant Daily Emissions**

| Source | Activity | Emissions (pounds per day) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | VOC | $NO_x$ | CO | $SO_x$ | $PM_{10}$ | $PM_{2.5}$ |
| Operation of Project | Panel Cleaning | 0.4 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| | Maintenance | 0.5 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| | Deliveries | 0.1 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| | Maximum (maintenance, deliveries) | 0.6 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.2 |
| Existing | Motor Vehicles | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| | Deliveries, Employees | 0.2 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.1 |
| | Farm Equipment | 1.4 | 9.1 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| | Maximum (total) | 1.7 | 10.6 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.9 |
| Net decrease with project | | -1.1 | -6.6 | -5.8 | 0.0 | -0.8 | -0.7 |
| Significance Threshold | | 137 | 137 | 548 | 137 | 82 | 82 |
| Significant Impact? | | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Notes: Fugitive dust is not estimated, as it is assumed to be similar for both existing and the proposed project. | | | | | | | |

**Table 5**
**Operational Air Pollutant Annual Emissions**

| Source | Activity | Emissions (tons per year) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | VOC | $NO_x$ | CO | $SO_x$ | $PM_{10}$ | $PM_{2.5}$ |
| Operation of Project | Panel Cleaning | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.05 | <0.01 | 0.01 | <0.01 |
| | Maintenance | <0.01 | 0.02 | 0.02 | <0.01 | <0.01 | <0.01 |
| | Deliveries | <0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | <0.01 | <0.01 | <0.01 |
| | Subtotal | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.07 | <0.01 | 0.01 | <0.01 |
| Existing | Motor Vehicles | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.15 | <0.01 | 0.02 | <0.01 |
| | Deliveries, Employees | <0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | <0.01 | <0.01 | <0.01 |
| | Farm Equipment | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.04 | <0.01 | <0.01 | <0.01 |
| | Subtotal | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.20 | <0.01 | 0.02 | <0.01 |
| **Net decrease with project** | | **-0.02** | **-0.02** | **-0.13** | **0.00** | **-0.01** | **0.00** |
| Significance Threshold | | 25 | 25 | 100 | 25 | 15 | 15 |
| Significant Impact? | | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Notes: Fugitive dust is not estimated, as it is assumed to be similar for both existing and the proposed project. | | | | | | | |

Site 2

Air emissions associated with the construction of the proposed project were calculated and compared to the AVAQMD thresholds. These emissions were generated using information such as number of days for particular activities (e.g., demolition, grading, etc.) and the number and types of equipment necessary. The calculated emissions reflect a worst case scenario as they analyze the impacts from the

development of the alternate access road as an unpaved road as it is 2,000 feet longer than the proposed access road. These emissions are shown in Tables 6 and 7, below. As can be seen from the tables, all of the emissions, except $PM_{10}$, would be less than the AVAQMD thresholds. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 1, requiring the paving of the access road, all construction emissions for Site 2 would be less than significant.

1. Prior to the start of construction on Site 2, the access road to the project site shall be paved and operational.

**Table 6**
**Construction Air Pollutant Daily Emissions (Site 2)**

| Source | Emissions (pounds per day) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | VOC | $NO_x$ | CO | $SO_x$ | $PM_{10}$ | $PM_{2.5}$ |
| Mass Grading | 9.1 | 75.3 | 40.0 | 0.1 | 47.3 | 10.1 |
| Fine Grading – road | 3.2 | 25.9 | 13.4 | 0.0 | 34.0 | 4.4 |
| Paving | 10.4 | 18.9 | 14.4 | 0.0 | 34.5 | 4.8 |
| Trenching | 2.9 | 17.9 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 37.3 | 4.9 |
| PV Installation | 3.9 | 28.3 | 25.2 | 0.0 | 130.5 | 14.2 |
| Combined: Fine Grading, Paving, Trenching, PV Installation | 20.4 | 91.0 | 67.3 | 0.0 | 236.3 | 28.3 |
| **Maximum Daily Emissions** | **20.4** | **91.0** | **67.3** | **0.1** | **236.3** | **28.3** |
| Significance Threshold | 137 | 137 | 548 | 137 | 82 | 82 |
| Significant Impact | No | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Notes: The maximum daily emissions refer to the maximum emissions that would occur in one day. It was assumed that the grading activities do not occur at the same time as the other construction activities; therefore, their emissions are not summed. Emissions include onsite and offsite activities. | | | | | | |

**Table 7**
**Construction Air Pollutant Annual Emissions (Site 2)**

| Source | Emissions (tons per year) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | VOC | $NO_x$ | CO | $SO_x$ | $PM_{10}$ | $PM_{2.5}$ |
| Mass Grading | 0.14 | 1.13 | 0.60 | 0.00 | 0.71 | 0.15 |
| Fine Grading – road | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.34 | 0.04 |
| Paving | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.02 |
| Trenching | 0.03 | 0.18 | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.37 | 0.05 |
| PV Installation | 0.29 | 2.12 | 1.89 | 0.00 | 9.79 | 1.07 |
| **Total** | **0.54** | **3.78** | **2.83** | **<0.01** | **11.38** | **1.33** |
| Significance Threshold | 25 | 25 | 100 | 25 | 15 | 15 |
| Significant Impact | No | No | No | No | No | No |

Operational air pollutant emissions are shown in Table 8 (daily) and Table 9 (annual). As shown in these tables, the emissions do not exceed the AVAQMD's significance thresholds. Therefore, operational impacts for Site 2 would be less than significant.

**Table 8**
**Operational Air Pollutant Daily Emissions (Site 2)**

| Source | Activity | Emissions (pounds per day) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | VOC | $NO_x$ | CO | $SO_x$ | $PM_{10}$ | $PM_{2.5}$ |
| Operation of Project | Panel Cleaning | 0.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| | Maintenance | 0.5 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| | Deliveries | 0.1 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| **Maximum (maintenance, deliveries)** | | **0.6** | **4.0** | **3.7** | **0.0** | **0.5** | **0.2** |
| Significance Threshold | | 137 | 137 | 548 | 137 | 82 | 82 |
| Significant Impact? | | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Notes: Fugitive dust is not estimated, as it is assumed to be similar for both existing and the proposed project. | | | | | | | |

**Table 9**
**Operational Air Pollutant Annual Emissions (Site 2)**

| Source | Activity | Emissions (tons per year) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | VOC | $NO_x$ | CO | $SO_x$ | $PM_{10}$ | $PM_{2.5}$ |
| Operation of Project | Panel Cleaning | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.05 | <0.01 | 0.01 | <0.01 |
| | Maintenance | <0.01 | 0.02 | 0.02 | <0.01 | <0.01 | <0.01 |
| | Deliveries | <0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | <0.01 | <0.01 | <0.01 |
| **Total** | | **0.01** | **0.08** | **0.07** | **<0.01** | **0.01** | **<0.01** |
| Significance Threshold | | 25 | 25 | 100 | 25 | 15 | 15 |
| Significant Impact? | | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Notes: Fugitive dust is not estimated, as it is assumed to be similar for both existing and the proposed project. | | | | | | | |

The construction and operational impacts for Site 1 would be less than significant. Additionally, the operational impacts would be less than currently exists on the project site with the operation of the alfalfa farm. The construction impacts for Site 2 would be potentially significant without implementation of Mitigation Measure 1. With implementation of the identified mitigation measure, impacts would be less than significant. Operational impacts for Site 2 would be less than significant.

c. The proposed projects, in conjunction with other development as allowed by the General Plan, would result in a cumulative increase of pollutants. However, since the emissions associated the construction and operation of these projects would be less than significant; their contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d. The closest sensitive receptors to Site 1 are the Del Sur Elementary School immediate adjacent to the project site to the south and east, and the single family residences immediately east of the project site along Avenue G. The closest sensitive receptors to Site 2 are single family residences located approximately 0.25 miles away. Based on the amount of traffic expected to be generated by the proposed projects, no significant traffic impacts would be anticipated. Additionally, air emissions from the construction and operation of the proposed projects would not exceed the thresholds established by the

AVAQMD with the implementation of the mitigation measure for Site 2. Therefore, substantial pollutant concentrations would not occur and impacts would be less than significant.

e. Construction and operation of the proposed projects is not anticipated to produce significant objectionable odors. Construction equipment may generate some odors, but these odors would be similar to those produced by vehicles traveling on 90th Street West, Avenue H, Avenue G, and Avenue I. Most objectionable odors are typically associated with industrial projects involving the use of chemicals, solvents, petroleum products and other strong smelling elements used in manufacturing processes, as well as sewage treatment facilities and landfills. These types of uses are not part of either of the proposed projects. Operation of the proposed projects would not generate any odors as the projects are photovoltaic solar electric generating facilities and no odorous chemicals would be utilized. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

IV. a. Biological resources surveys were conducted for each of the proposed projects by Chambers Group and documented in separate reports. The original survey for Site 1 is documented in a report entitled "Biological Technical Report for the Summer Solar Project Site (2-84), City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California" and dated April 2012. A subsequent biological report was prepared to address the entire site including the additional 77 acres. This report is entitled "Biological Technical Report for the Minna Greenworks and Summer Solar Project Sites, City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, CA" and dated July 2012. The survey for Site 2 is documented in a report entitled "Biological Technical Report for the Springtime Solar Project Site (2-85), City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California" and dated April 2012. The following summarizes the results of these surveys for both project sites.

Site 1

Surveys were conducted on the entire project site (135 acres) between May 18 and May 20, 2011. The southern portion (58 acres) of the project site consists of ruderal vegetation with small areas of Non-native Annual Grasslands and Rubber Rabbitbrush Scrub. The non-native annual grasslands are located at the southeast corner of the panhandle. The Rubber Rabbitbrush Scrub is located near Avenue G-8 and 90th Street West. The northern half (77 acres) of the project site consists of active agricultural fields with some Ruderal habitat along Avenue G. The following plant species were observed during the surveys: mule fat (*Baccharis salicifolia*), pineapple weed (*Chamomilla suaveolens*), rubber rabbitbrush (*Chrysothamnus nauseosus*), horseweed (*Conyza* sp.), prickly lettuce (*Lactuca serriola*), coast goldfields (*Lasthenia californica*), cudweed aster (*Lessingia filanginifolia*), silver puff (*Uropappus lindleyi*), fiddlenecks (*Amsinckia* sp.), slender pectocarya (*Pectocarya linearis* ssp. *ferocula*), pectocarya (*Pectocarya* sp.), tumble mustard (*Sisymbrium altissimum*), saltbush (*Atriplex* sp.), rattlesnake weed (*Chamaesyce albomarginata*), doveweed (*Eremocarpus setigerus*), red-stemmed filaree (*Erodium cicutarium*), phacelia (*Phacelia* sp.), horehound (*Marrubium vulgare*), vinegar weed (*Trichostema lanceolatum*), velvet ash (*Fraxinus velutina*), tamarisk (*Tamarix* sp.), foxtail chess (*Bromus madritensis* spp. *rubens*), cheat grass (*Bromus tectorum*), glaucous foxtail barley (*Hordeum murinum*), ripgut brome (*Bromus tectorum*), Mediterranean grass (*Schismus barbatus*), fescue (*Vulpia myuros*), Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*), California evening primrose (*Oenothera californica*), alfalfa, rat-tail fescue (*Vulpia myuros*) and ripgut grass (*Bromus diandrus*). No special status plant species were observed on the project site and none are expected to occur due to a lack of suitable habitat or the site is outside the elevation range or historic range of the species.

The following wildlife species were observed on the project site: California ground squirrel (*Spermophilus beecheyi*), common raven (*Corvus corax*), horned lark (*Eremophila alepestris*), gopher (*Thomomys* sp.), black-tailed jack rabbit (*Lepus californicus*), western meadowlark (*Sturnella neglecta*) and side-blotched lizard (*Uta stansburiana*). No special status species were observed on the project site. There is no suitable habitat on-site for either Mohave ground squirrel or desert tortoise. There is low-quality habitat on-site for coast horned lizard, silvery legless lizard and ferruginous hawk. Additionally, the nearest recorded occurrence for these species is at least 3 miles away.

Burrowing owls, or sign thereof, were not observed on the project site. However, suitable habitat exists on-site for burrowing owls and several small mammal burrows were observed on-site which could be utilized by burrowing owls. Additionally, burrowing owls have been observed within a mile of the project site. Removal of the existing vegetation and the installation of a solar electric generating facility have the potential to impact burrowing owls if the species was to move onto the project site prior to the start of construction. However, a preconstruction survey, as identified below, would be conducted prior to the start of project construction activities to ensure any potential impacts remain less than significant.

Swainson's hawk was not observed utilizing the project site. However, the power poles adjacent to the project site could provide nesting habitat for the Swainson's hawk and a Swainson's hawk was observed foraging a mile away. No nests were observed during the field survey. The power poles would not be removed as part of the proposed project; therefore, no impacts to potential nesting habitat would occur. A known Swainson's hawk nest exists within 5 miles of the project site and the project could be used for foraging. There is approximately 160,749 acres of suitable foraging habitat within 10 miles of the known nest. The proposed project would remove 135 acres of potential foraging habitat or 0.08% of the available foraging habitat. This impact would be less than significant. However, the project applicant would be required to comply with mitigation measure identified below to ensure that impacts remain less than significant.

Site 2

A survey of the project site was conducted on May 18, 2011. The majority of the project site consists of Non-native Annual Grassland with small areas of Rubber Rabbitbrush Scrub and Valley Needlegrass Grassland. The Valley Needlegrass Grassland is located in the north central portion of the project site. The Rubber Rabbitbrush scrub is located in various locations scattered throughout the project site. The following plant species were observed during the survey: pineapple weed (*Chamomilla suaveolens*), rubber rabbitbrush (*Chrysothamnus nauseosus*), rattlesnake weed (*Chamaesyce albomarginata*), dove weed (*Eremocarpus setigerus*), red-stemmed filaree (*Erodium cicutarium*), catepillar phacelia (*Phacelia cicutaria*), vinegar weed (*Trichostema lanceolatum*), foxtail chess (*Bromus madritensis* ssp.), purple needlegrass (*Nassella pulchra*), fescue (*Vulpia myuras*), phacelia (*Phacelia* sp.), cryptantha (*Cryptantha* spp.), clover (*Trifolium* spp.), and popcorn flower (*Plagiobothrys* spp.). No special status plant species were observed on the project site and none are expected to occur due to a lack of suitable habitat.

The following wildlife species were observed on the project site: California ground squirrel (*Spermophilus beecheyi*) burrows, western meadowlark (*Sturnella neglecta*), Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), common raven (*Corvus corax*), horned lark (*Eremophila alepestris*) and domestic goat (*Capra hircus*). There is no suitable habitat on-site for either Mohave ground squirrel or desert tortoise. There is low-quality habitat on-site for coast horned lizard, silvery legless lizard, and ferruginous hawk. Additionally, the nearest recorded occurrence of these species is at least 3 miles away. Therefore, the

proposed project is not expected to impact Mohave ground squirrel, desert tortoise, coast horned lizard, silvery legless lizard or ferruginous hawk.

Burrowing owls, or sign thereof, were not identified on Site 2. However, suitable habitat exists on-site for burrowing owls and several small mammal burrows were observed on-site which could be utilized by burrowing owls. Additionally, burrowing owls have been observed within a mile of the project site. Removal of the existing vegetation and the installation of a solar electric generating facility have the potential to impact burrowing owls if the species was to move onto the project site prior to the start of construction. However, a preconstruction survey, as identified below, would be conducted prior to the start of project construction activities to ensure any potential impacts remain less than significant.

A Swainson's hawk was observed flying over and foraging on the project site and the tamarisk trees and power poles adjacent to the project site could provide suitable nesting habitat for the Swainson's hawk. No nests were observed during the field survey. These trees and power poles would not be removed as part of the proposed project; therefore, no impacts to nesting habitat would occur. A known Swainson's hawk nest exists within 5 miles of the project site and the project site could be/is used for foraging. There is approximately 160,749 acres of suitable foraging habitat within 10 miles of the known nest. The proposed project would remove 158 acres of potential foraging habitat or 0.09% of the available foraging habitat. This impact would be less than significant. Even if both project sites were combined, the combined projects would only remove 0.13% of the available foraging habitat. However, the project applicant would be required to comply with mitigation measure identified below to ensure that impacts remain less than significant.

The following mitigation measures apply to both of the project sites. With implementation of these measures, impacts to biological resources would be less than significant.

2. A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities in accordance with established burrowing owl protocols. If burrowing owls or sign thereof are discovered during the survey, the applicant shall contact the California Department of Fish and Game to determine the appropriate mitigation/management requirements for the species.

3. A Swainson's hawk survey shall be conducted on the project site prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities in accordance with established Swainson's hawk protocols. If Swainson's hawks are identified using the project site during the survey, the applicant shall contact the California Department of Fish and Game to determine the appropriate mitigation/management requirements.

b. The project sites do not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

c. There are no federally protected wetlands on the project sites as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

d. The project sites are not part of an established migratory wildlife corridor. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

e-f. The project sites are not located within an area designated under an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State Habitat Conservation Plan. Additionally, there are no local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources which are applicable to this site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

V. a-d. Cultural resource surveys were conducted for each of the project sites by Michael Brandman Associates. These surveys included records searches, historical aerial photograph review, sacred lands file searches and field surveys. The following discusses the results for each of the project sites in detail.

Site 1

Two cultural resources surveys were conducted for the property that comprises Site 1. The southern 58 acres was documented in a report entitled "Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of Silverado Power's Proposed Summer Solar Generating Facility Project, CUP #2-84, APN 3219-017-019, City of Lancaster, California" and dated April 25, 2012. The northern 77 acres was documented in a report entitled "Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of Silverado Power's Proposed Minna Greenworks Solar Generating Facility, AIN #3219-016-003, City of Lancaster, California" and dated July 23, 2012. These reports included a records review, review of historical aerial photographs, a sacred lands file request and a field survey.

Historical aerial photographs of the southern portion of the project site (58 acres) were reviewed from 1940, 1954, 1959, 1965, 1971, 1974, and 2005. The photographs from 1940-1965 depict plowed fields. The photographs from 1971 onward depict fallow, unplowed, and unirrigated land. Historical aerial photographs of the northern portion of the project site (77 acres) were reviewed from 1948, 1954, 1968, 1974, 1989, 1994, and 2005. All of the aerial photographs, with the exception of 1989, depict some type of agriculture use (crop production) of the property. The 1989 photograph shows the property as dry and possibly grazed by sheep. The aerial photographs also show the house and outbuildings starting in 1948.

On March 29, 2012 a records search of the entire project site was conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) and involved the inventories of the National Register, the California Register, the California Historical Landmarks List and the California Points of Historical Interest List. The search focused on the project site and properties within 0.75 miles of the project site. The project site was not identified on any of these lists. Two recorded historic sites were identified within the vicinity of the project, but would not be impacted by the proposed project.

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted on March 28, 2012 to request a search of the Sacred Lands File for any traditional cultural properties on or in the vicinity of the project site. No sacred lands or traditional cultural properties were identified in the area. In addition, a letter was sent to the seven NAHC tribal contacts on April 2, 2012 and July 23, 2012 to determine if they had any concerns associated with the proposed project. To date, no response from these individuals has been received.

A pedestrian survey of southern portion of the project site was conducted on April 2, 2012. No archaeological or historic resources were identified on Site 1. On July 13, 2012, a pedestrian survey of the northern 77 acres was conducted. The northern portion of the project site was covered with irrigated alfalfa, which made a block transect survey impossible due to the impenetrable views of the ground surface. Irrigation pipe rings the alfalfa fields and access to the undergrounded pipes is obtained from the edges of the parcel. However, the farm exhibited a series of buildings and a well that are likely more than 45 years old.

The farm complex exhibits a house roughly 1250 feet south of Avenue G and 130 feet east of 95th Street West. The house exhibits an attached parking area with metal shed roof, dog run and 1,000 square foot barn-like outbuilding. A second older-looking shed roofed structure is located on the farm property about 120 feet southwest of the house. The structures of the farm are enclosed in a chain link fence that encloses a portion of the parcel 427' by 277' in size. Small outbuildings dot the farm, including a newer horse paddock and corral, a hot walker for the horse in the northeast corner and a dog run. The gate off 95th leads to narrow concrete pavement, which brings traffic to the front door of the house, which faces east and away from prevailing winds. A shed garage is located between the house and the small barn. The house is a wood-clad hipped roof vernacular building with the long axis of the structure from the south to north. The buildings on the property have not been constructed in any distinctive manner. The structure south of the driveway is a small bar and attached metal roofed shed that looks well-worn and contains peacocks. Finally, the site includes a well and pump located about 2,300 feet south of West Avenue G. This was once the site of a dirt banked reservoir, but this was plowed under about 7 years ago so that alfalfa could be grown. The LA Assessor's office states that the first structure on the project site was built in 1939 and a second improvement occurred in 1956. The 1958 Del Sur topographic map shows an additional building just south of the house, which is the peacock shed located just south of the paved driveway. The historical record and internet name searches show that the various owners of the property are not notable.

According to CCR 15064.5, any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources including the following:

- Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's historic and cultural heritage;
- Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction or represent the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; and
- Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Based on the information above, the site is not eligible for listing in the California Register and impacts would be less than significant. Development of the project site would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or geologic feature. No human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, were discovered on the project site. Therefore, no impacts to cultural resources would occur. However, in the event that cultural resources are encountered during the course of construction work, all work shall cease until a qualified archaeologist determines the proper disposition of the resource

Site 2

The cultural resources survey for Site 2 was documented in a report entitled "Phase I Cultural Resource Survey for Silverado Power's Proposed Springtime Solar Generating Facility Project CUP (2-85), APN #3265-021-001, -002, -003, -004, City of Lancaster, California" and dated April 25, 2012. The report included a records review, review of historical aerial photographs, a sacred lands file request and a field survey. Historical aerial photographs were reviewed from 1940, 1954, 1959, 1965, 1971, 1974, and 2005. The photographs from 1940-1974 depict either plowed fields or indications of active agriculture. The aerial photograph from 2005 depicts property that has not been utilized for agricultural purposes for many years but weed abatement may have occurred.

On March 29, 2012 a records search was conducted at the SCCIC and involved the inventories of the National Register, the California Register, the California Historical Landmarks List and the California Points of Historical Interest List. The search focused on the project site and properties within 0.75 miles of the project site. The project site was not identified on any of these lists. Two recorded historic sites and a prehistoric isolate (chert scraper) were identified within the vicinity of the project site, but would not be impacted by the proposed project.

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted on March 28, 2012 to request a search of the Sacred Lands File for any traditional cultural properties on or in the vicinity of the project site. No sacred lands or traditional cultural properties were identified in the area. In addition, a letter was sent to the seven NAHC tribal contacts on April 2, 2012 to determine if they had any concerns associated with the proposed project. As of the date of the report, no responses had been received.

On April 2, 2012 a pedestrian survey of the projects site was conducted. No archaeological or historic resources were identified on Site 2. Development of the project site would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or geologic feature. No human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, were discovered on the project site. Therefore, no impacts to cultural resources would occur. However, in the event that cultural resources are encountered during the course of construction work, all work shall cease until a qualified archaeologist determines the proper disposition of the resource.

VI. a. The project sites are not identified as being in or in proximity to a fault rupture zone (LMEA Figure 2-5). According to the Seismic Hazard Evaluation of the Lancaster East and West Quadrangles, the project sites may be subject to intense seismic shaking (LMEA pg. 2-16). However, the proposed projects would be constructed in accordance with the seismic requirements of the Uniform Building Code (UBC) adopted by the City, which would render any potential impacts to a less than significant level. The site is generally level and is not subject to landslides (SSHZ).

Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which the strength and stiffness of a soil is reduced by earthquake shaking or other events. This phenomenon occurs in saturated soils that undergo intense seismic shaking typically associated with an earthquake. There are three specific conditions that need to be in place for liquefaction to occur: loose granular soils, shallow groundwater (usually less than 50 feet below ground surface) and intense seismic shaking. In February 2005, the California Geologic Survey updated the Seismic Hazard Zones Map for Lancaster (SSHZ). Based on these maps, the project sites are not located in an area at risk for liquefaction. No impacts would occur.

b. Both project sites are rated as having a none to slight risk for soil erosion (USDA SCS Maps) when cultivated or cleared of vegetation. However, there remains a potential for water and wind erosion during construction. The proposed projects would be required, under the provisions of the Lancaster

Municipal Code (LMC) Chapter 8.16, to adequately wet or seal the soil to prevent wind erosion. Additionally, the following mitigation measure shall be required to control dust/wind erosion.

4. A Dust Control Plan in accordance with Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) Rule 403 shall be submitted prior to the start of grading/construction activities.

Water erosion controls must be provided as part of the proposed projects' grading plans to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineering Division. These provisions, which are a part of the proposed projects, would reduce any impacts to less than significant levels.

c. Subsidence is the sinking of the soil caused by the extraction of water, petroleum, etc. Subsidence can result in geologic hazards known as fissures. Fissures are typically associated with faults or groundwater withdrawal, which results in the cracking of the ground surface. According to Figure 2-3 of the City of Lancaster's Master Environmental Assessment, the closest sinkholes and fissures to the project sites are located at Avenue I/55$^{th}$ Street West and Avenue G/50$^{th}$ Street West. These are approximately 3.5 miles east of Site 1 and 4.5 miles east of Site 2. The project sites are not known to be within an area subject to fissuring, sinkholes or subsidence (LMEA Figure 2-3) or any other form of geologic unit or soil instability. For a discussion of potential impacts regarding liquefaction, please refer to Item VI.a. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

d. The soil on both project sites is characterized by a low shrink/swell potential (LMEA Figure 2-3), which is not an expansive soil as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code. A soils report for each of the project sites shall be submitted to the City by the project developer prior to grading of the property and the recommendations of the reports shall be incorporated into the development of the project sites. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e. No sewer or septic connections are proposed as part of the proposed projects. The proposed projects are photovoltaic solar electric generating facilities and there are no structures on the project sites that would be occupied. Most activities with respect to operation of the proposed projects would be conducted remotely. A portable restroom facility would be provided on-site during construction and maintenance activities. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

VII. a. The greenhouse gas emissions from the construction and operation of the proposed projects were calculated using CalEEMod and documented in the technical reports that are referenced in Item III.b. These emissions are compared to the AVAQMD thresholds for greenhouse gases and the results are summarized in Tables 10 through 13. Tables 10 and 11 summarize the greenhouse gases generated for Site 1 during construction and operation, respectively. Tables 12 and 13 summarize the greenhouse gases generated for Site 2 during construction and operation, respectively.

**Table 10**
**Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Site 1)**

| Phase | Activity | $CO_2e$ Emissions (pounds per day) | | | Days | Emissions (tons $CO_2e$) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Onsite | Offsite | Subtotal | | |
| Construction | Demolition | 3,180 | 260 | 3,440 | 6 | 10 |
| | Mass Grading | 7,764 | 712 | 8,476 | 20 | 85 |
| | Fine Grading | 3,113 | 548 | 3,661 | 20 | 37 |
| | Trenching | 1,365 | 712 | 2,077 | 20 | 21 |
| | PV Installation | 1,939 | 2,806 | 4,745 | 150 | 356 |
| **Maximum daily emissions and total** | | | | **8,476** | --- | **509** |
| District's significance threshold | | | | 548,000 | --- | 100,000 |
| Does project exceed threshold? Significant impact? | | | | No | --- | No |
| Note: $CO_2e$ = carbon dioxide equivalents | | | | | | |

**Table 11**
**Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Site 1)**

| Phase | Activity | CO2E Emissions (pounds per day) | | | Days/ year | Emissions (tons CO2E) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Onsite | Offsite | Subtotal | | |
| Operation of project | Panel Cleaning | 259 | 94 | 353 | 40 | 7 |
| | Maintenance | 371 | 94 | 465 | 15 | 3 |
| | Deliveries | 0 | 247 | 247 | 10 | 1 |
| | Maximum Subtotal | 371 | 341 | 712 | --- | 4 |
| Existing | Residential vehicles | 0 | 110 | 110 | 365 | 20 |
| | Deliveries, employees | 0 | 391 | 391 | 10 | 2 |
| | Farm equipment | 1,035 | 0 | 1,035 | 10 | 5 |
| | Maximum subtotal | 1,035 | 501 | 1,536 | --- | 27 |
| **Net decrease with project** | | | | **-824** | --- | **-23** |
| District's significance threshold | | | | 548,000 | --- | 100,000 |
| Does project exceed threshold? Significant impact? | | | | No | --- | No |
| Notes: $CO_2e$ = carbon dioxide equivalents<br>The maximum for the operation of the project is the maintenance + the deliveries, since panel cleaning would not take place during maintenance. | | | | | | |

**Table 12**
**Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Site 2)**

| Phase | Activity | $CO_2e$ Emissions (pounds per day) | | | Days | Emissions (tons $CO_2e$) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Onsite | Offsite | Subtotal | | |
| Construction | Mass Grading | 8,308 | 712 | 9,020 | 30 | 135 |
| | Fine Grading | 3,658 | 548 | 4,206 | 20 | 42 |
| | Paving | 1,614 | 548 | 2,162 | 10 | 11 |
| | Trenching | 1,572 | 712 | 2,284 | 20 | 23 |
| | PV Installation | 2,257 | 3,100 | 5,357 | 150 | 402 |
| **Maximum daily emissions and total** | | | | **14,009** | --- | **613** |
| District's significance threshold | | | | 548,000 | --- | 100,000 |
| Does project exceed threshold? Significant impact? | | | | No | --- | No |

Notes: $CO_2e$ = carbon dioxide equivalents
The maximum daily emissions are the sum of fine grading, paving, trenching, and PV installation.

**Table 13**
**Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Site 2)**

| Activity | $CO_2e$ Emissions (pounds/day) | | | Days | Emissions (tons $CO_2e$) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Onsite | Offsite | Subtotal | | |
| Panel Cleaning | 259 | 118 | 377 | 45 | 8 |
| Maintenance | 371 | 94 | 465 | 15 | 3 |
| Deliveries | 0 | 247 | 247 | 10 | 1 |
| **Maximum Daily Emissions and Total** | | | **712** | --- | **12** |
| District's Significance Threshold | | | 548,000 | --- | 100,000 |
| Does project exceed threshold? Significant Impact | | | No | --- | No |

Notes: $CO_2e$ = carbon dioxide equivalents
The maximum emissions for the operation of the project are the maintenance + the deliveries, since panel cleaning would not take place during maintenance.

As shown in the tables above, while the proposed project would generate greenhouse gas emissions during construction and operation, these emissions fall well below the thresholds established by the AVAQMD. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b. The California State Legislature adopted Assembly Bill (AB) 32 in 2006. AB 32 focuses on reducing greenhouse gases to 1990 levels by the year 2020. Pursuant to the requirements in identified AB 32, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) adopted the Climate Change Scoping Plan in 2008, which outlines actions recommended to obtain that goal. The Scoping Plan calls for cutting approximately 30 percent from business-as-usual emission levels predicted for 2020 or about 10 percent from today's levels. One of the strategies is to obtain 33 percent of all energy statewide from renewable energy source. Another strategy is the million solar roofs program, which aims to install 3,000 MW of solar-electric capacity under California's existing solar programs. The proposed projects are consistent with these strategies as they would install solar PV in California. Additionally, the proposed projects

would be consistent with Policy 3.6.6 and Specific Actions 3.6.6(a) and 3.6.6(b) of the City's General Plan which specifically address the use and development of alternative energy.

The proposed projects will generate zero-emission solar power intended to reduce the use of fossil fuels in California electric power production. The lowest emitting fossil-fueled power plants are combined cycle gas turbine facilities. The proposed project on Site 1 would generate approximately 20 MW. The proposed project on Site 2 would generate approximately 40 MW which equates to approximately 45,000 megawatt-hours per year (MWh) and 90,000 MWh per year, respectively. The proposed project would also result in substantial reductions in greenhouse gases from offsetting the use of fossil-fueled power plants. The proposed projects would save over 42,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (13,000 $MTCO_2e$ for Site 1; 29,000 $MTCO_2e$ for Site 2) in the first year of operation. Over the lifetime of the two projects, a total of 1,476,000 $MTCO_2e$ would be saved (476,000 $MTCO_2e$ for Site 1 and 1,000,000 $MTCO_2e$ for Site 2).

The proposed projects would not conflict with the goals of AB 32, the scoping plan measures, City of Lancaster policies and the proposed projects would reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

VIII. a-b. Site 1 consists of the construction and operation of a 20 MW solar facility on approximately 135 acres. Site 2 consists of the construction and operation of a 40 MW solar facility on approximately 158 acres. The proposed projects would use minimal amounts of hazardous materials during construction activities. These include routine construction materials such as concrete, asphalt, and petroleum products, etc. During operation, the only hazardous materials that would be utilized are dielectric fluid and mineral oil. Use of all materials would be in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations. The proposed projects are not located along a hazardous materials/waste transportation corridor (LMEA Figure 9.1-4). Site 2 and the southern portion of Site 1 are vacant and consist of fallow agricultural fields. The northern half of Site 1 consists of alfalfa fields and a farm house complex (see Item Va-d). Due to the age of the farm house complex, it is likely that the structures contain asbestos and/or lead-based paint. Therefore, the mitigation measures listed below are required for Site 1. With implementation of the mitigation measures impacts would be less than significant.

5. Prior to any demolition activities on Site 1, an asbestos survey shall be conducted to determine the presence or absence of asbestos and the results shall be submitted to the City of Lancaster. If asbestos containing-materials are located, abatement of asbestos shall be completed prior to any demolition activities. Asbestos removal shall be performed by a State certified asbestos containment contractor in accordance with Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District Rule 1403.

6. Prior to any demolition activities on Site 1, a lead-based paint survey shall be conducted to determine the presence or absence of lead-based paint and the results shall be submitted to the City of Lancaster. If lead-based paint is located, abatement shall be completed prior to any demolition in accordance with California Code of Regulation Title 8, Section 1532.1.

c. Site 1 is located within a quarter mile of an existing school. Specifically, Del Sur Elementary School is located at 9023 West Avenue H, which is immediately south and east of the project site. The proposed project may utilize some hazardous materials (typical construction materials) during construction of the solar generating facility. The only hazardous materials that would be utilized during operation would be mineral oil and dielectric fluid. The proposed project would not emit hazardous

emissions or handle hazardous/acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Site 2 is not located within a quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The closest school is Del Sur Elementary School which is approximately 1 mile east of the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

d. Phase I Environmental Site Assessments were prepared for both project sites by Tetra Tech EC, Inc. The original survey for Site 1 is documented in a report entitled "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Summer Solar Project (2-84), Lancaster, California" and dated April 2012. A subsequent report was prepared to address the additional 77 acres that are part of Site 1. This report is entitled "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Minna Greenworks, Solar Generation Facility, Lancaster, California" and dated July 2012. The survey for Site 2 is documented in a report entitled "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Springtime Solar Project (2-85), Lancaster, California" and dated April 2012.

Site 1

A site visit was conducted on the southern half of the property on April 4, 2012. The southern half (58) of the project site consists of rural, fallow agricultural land with no buildings or building remnants. This portion of the site is irregularly shaped consisting of a square with a panhandle extending approximately 1,300 feet southward from the southwest side and is predominantly flat with a gentle slope to the east. A few structures are apparent that suggest previous farming activities. These include two 30-inch diameter concrete irrigation standpipes located on the south and east sides. At the southern tip of this area (along Avenue H), the remnants of a former irrigation pond were observed. The pond is approximately 50 feet wide by 100 feet long, 5 to 7 feet deep and filled within tumbleweeds. Adjacent to the pond is a 30-inch diameter concrete irrigation standpipe and an 8-inch diameter metal pipe running from the surface towards the standpipe. Several cylindrically-shaped concrete supports were exposed and abandoned near the pond. All of these items are thought to be related to operations associated with the former irrigation pond and irrigation operation in general. Minor amounts of debris were observed scattered throughout the project site. This debris included a plastic car bumper, several tires, and an empty plastic jug. No evidence of stained soil, stressed vegetation or hazardous materials was found on the project site.

A site visit on the northern half of the property was conducted on July 17, 2012. The northern half (77 acres) of the project site consists of a farmhouse complex surrounded by alfalfa fields. The property is nearly flat with a gradual slope to the east. The farmhouse complex is approximately 3 acres in size and is fenced and gated around the perimeter. The farmhouse complex a house, outlying storage shed, 1 5,000 gallon water tank, horse barns and corrals, miscellaneous farm equipment, and stacked farm supplies and products such as irrigation pipe and hay bales. Two wells with associated pumps are located on the property, one within the complex and the other approximately 800 feet south of the complex. A drum approximately half full of liquid is located adjacent to the well. Based on owner information, the drum contains pump oil used to lubricate the well pump motor. Three power poles within the property contain pole-mounted transformers. Labeling on the transformers to determine if they contain PCBs could not be discerned.

During the site reconnaissance there was no evidence that indicated a hazardous release or spill at the property. Paint cans and drums, located both in the shed and along 95$^{th}$ Street West, may contain minor amounts of hazardous substances and should therefore be property disposed. The storage shed may also contain small amounts of unidentified chemicals that will require disposal at a local hazardous waste

facility. No pesticides or herbicides were observed and no records of storage or spills outside of regulated such of such chemicals exist.

Site 2

A site visit was conducted for Site 2 on April 4, 2012. The project site consists of rural, fallow agricultural land with no buildings or building remnants. The property slopes gently to the east and there is a visible topographic low area within the southerly portion. Indicators of past agricultural activities included abandoned irrigation ponds on adjacent properties and remnant agricultural and drainage furrows. Multiple areas within the project site appear to have been the site of former animal pens. Minor, de minimis trash, observed scattered randomly throughout the project site included a discarded box spring frame, a solitary brick and a pile of broken bricks along the northern property line. An exposed but capped metal pipe, possibly associated with a water line, was observed near the center of the property and an abandoned water well was observed on the easterly adjacent property. An existing electrical distribution line was observed along the northerly property boundary and more major transmission lines were noted on the westerly adjacent properties. Markers indicating the presence of a high-pressure gas main were noted on the east side of 100th Street West and along the north side of West Avenue H. No evidence of stained soil, stressed vegetation or hazardous materials was found on the project site.

In addition to the site visits, a regulatory records review was conducted for both project sites. The database searches were conducted using publicly available regulatory records detailed in the Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) reports dated March 29, 2012 and July 11, 2012 (northern half of Site 1). The project sites and the properties within standard distances of the project sites were reviewed to identify sites that might potentially impact the soil and/or groundwater conditions. Neither of the project sites were identified in any of the regulatory records. The property surrounding Site 2 and most of the property surrounding Site 1 were also not identified in any of the regulatory database. Del Sur Elementary School was identified as having had an underground storage tank or currently having an underground storage tank. However, no records of any leaks, spills, or releases were identified. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Based on the survey of the projects sites, both locations contain active and/or abandoned water wells. In the event that these wells will not be utilized to provide water on the project sites during operation, they shall be closed in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations as identified in Mitigation Measure 7. Additionally, Site 2 contains 3 power poles on which confirmation that the transformers did not contain PCBs was not readily discernible on the field visits. Prior to the removal of these transformers, confirmation must be obtained as to the presence or absence of PCBs. If PCBs are present, and the transformers will be replaced, the replacement shall occur in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations (Mitigation Measure 89). With implementation of the mitigation measures identified below, impacts would be less than significant.

7. In the event that the existing well(s) on the project sites will not be utilized during project operation or other wells are found on-site, the applicant shall abandon the wells in accordance with all existing rules and regulations.

8. Prior to the removal of the transformers located on the northern portion of Site 1, confirmation must be obtained as to the presence or absence of PCBs. In the event that PCBs are present, the transformers will be removed and disposed of in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations.

e-f. The project sites are not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport, public use airport, or private airstrip. The closest airport to the project sites is the General William Fox Airfield, which is located approximately 3 miles east of Site 1 and 4 miles east of Site 2. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people working in the project area and no impacts would occur.

g. Access to Site 1 would be taken from 90th Street West and Avenue G. These roadways are already paved with one travel lane in each direction and the access gates would be set back approximately 50 feet from the edge of right-of-way to allow vehicles to pull off the roadway while the gate is opening. Access to Site 2 would be taken from Avenue I via a 30-foot wide paved access road along 100th Street West. The access gate would be located at the southeast corner of the project site off of 100th Street West. 100th Street West and Avenue I have not been designated as evacuation routes in the vicinity of the project sites. Avenue H is an evacuation route starting at 90th Street West and heading east. 90th Street West is an evacuation route starting at Avenue L and heading north to the Los Angeles/Kern County line. However, the traffic generated by the proposed projects is not sufficient to cause impacts at any of the area intersections. Therefore, the proposed projects would not impact or physically block any identified evacuation routes and would not interfere with any adopted emergency response plan. No impacts are anticipated.

h. The property surrounding the project sites is predominantly undeveloped, through surrounding uses include a substation, elementary school, ranches, and a scattering of single family residences (see Surrounding Land Use description). It is possible that these lands could be subject to a grass fire. However, Site 1 is located within the boundaries of Station 112, located at 8812 Avenue E-8 and Site 2 is located within the boundaries of Station 130, located at 44558 40th Street West, which would serve the project sites in the event of a fire. Additionally, the project sites could also be served by units at Station 84, located at 5030 Avenue L-14. Therefore, impacts from wildland fires would be less than significant.

IX. a. The project sites are not located in an area with an open body of water or watercourse and are not in an aquifer recharge area. Additionally, the proposed projects would be required to comply with all applicable provisions of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. The NPDES program establishes a comprehensive storm water quality program to manage urban storm water and minimize pollution of the environment to the maximum extent practicable. The reduction of pollutants in urban storm water discharge through the use of structural and nonstructural Best Management Practices (BMPs) is one of the primary objectives of the water quality regulations. BMPs that are typically used to management runoff water quality include controlling roadway and parking lot contaminants by installing oil and grease separators at storm drain inlets, cleaning parking lots on a regular basis, incorporating peak-flow reduction and infiltration features (grass swales, infiltration trenches and grass filter strips) into landscaping and implementing educational programs. The proposed projects would incorporate appropriate BMPs as applicable, as determined by the City of Lancaster Department of Public Works. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed projects involve the construction and operation of photovoltaic solar electric generating facilities. These facilities would not utilize large quantities of hazardous materials and would not be tied into the public sewer system or septic system. As such, the proposed projects do not have the potential to introduce industrial discharge into a public water system and potentially violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b. The proposed projects would truck water to the project sites for the occasional washing of the PV panels. Washing would occur approximately twice a year. No employees would be located on the site. During site maintenance employees would bring drinking water with them and portable restroom facilities would be provided on-site. However, the project sites would not be tied to a public water, sewer or septic system. Additionally, as indicated in Item IX.a, the proposed projects would not impact any groundwater recharge areas. Therefore, the proposed projects would not deplete ground water supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge and impacts would be less than significant.

c-e. Development of the proposed projects would increase the amount of surface runoff as a result of impervious surfaces associated with some portions of the facility. Most of the project sites would be developed with PV panels mounted on tracking systems on steel support structures. The project sites would be grubbed and potentially graded to accommodate the support structures but would not be paved, leaving the sites in a predominantly pervious condition. Additionally, the proposed projects would be designed to accept current flows entering the property and to handle any additional incremental runoff from the project sites. Therefore, impacts from drainage and runoff would be less than significant.

f-g. The southern half of Site 1 is designated as Flood Zone X-Shaded per the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Panel No. 060672 (2008). This area is outside of the 100-year flood zone but within the 500-year flood zone. The northern half of the project site is designated as Flood Zone X which is outside both the 100-year and 500-year flood zone. Site 2 is designated as primarily Flood Zone X, with the area along Avenue H (future) designated as Flood Zone A. Most of the site is located outside of both the 100-year flood zone and the 500-year flood zone. However, the portion along Avenue H is within the 100-year flood zone (Zone A). This designation requires the elevation of structures above the base flood elevation and flood insurance. No occupied structures are proposed for either project site. The proposed substation for Site 2 would not be located within the Zone A portion of the project site. All electrical equipment would be elevated above the base flood elevation, as necessary. Therefore, flooding impacts with respect to structures would be less than significant. No housing is proposed on either site and no flooding impacts as a result of placing housing in a flood zone would occur.

h. The project sites do not contain and are not downstream from a dam or levee. Therefore, no impacts would occur from flooding as a result of the failure of a dam or levee.

i. The project sites are not located within a coastal zone. Therefore, tsunamis are not a potential hazard. The project sites are relatively flat and do not contain any enclosed bodies of water and are not located in close proximity to any other large bodies of water. Therefore, the proposed projects would not be subject to inundation by seiches or mudflows. No impact would occur.

X. a. The proposed projects are not of the scale or nature that could physically divide an established community. The proposed projects consist of the construction and operation of photovoltaic solar electric generating facilities. The area surrounding the project sites is predominantly vacant with a SCE substation, school, ranches, and a scattering of single family homes in the area. Access to Site 1 would be from 90$^{th}$ Street West and Avenue G which are paved roads with one travel lane in each direction. Access to Site 2 would be from Avenue I, which is a paved road with one travel lane in each direction, via a 30-foot wide paved access road which would be constructed at approximately 100$^{th}$ Street West. This access road would run from Avenue I northward to approximately future Avenue H-8. The proposed projects would not block a public street, trail or other access route or result in a physical barrier that would divide the community. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

b. The southern half of Site 1 and all of Site 2 are currently designated as Urban Residential (UR) and zoned a mix of R-7,000 (single family residential, minimum lot size 7,000 square feet) and R-10,000 (single family residential, minimum lot size 10,000 square feet). Solar generating facilities are not allowed in areas designated as UR. Development Agreement No. 89-01 also applies to these areas and expires on October 17, 2012. This Development Agreement prevents the City from changing the general plan designation and zoning on the portions of the project sites covered by the agreement. However, the owner of the properties signed the application form granting permission to file and has submitted a letter requesting that the Development Agreement be rescinded on these properties. Additionally, the applicant has requested a General Plan Amendment (GPA) to change the designation to Non-Urban Residential (NU) and a Zone Change (ZC) to change the zoning to RR-2.5 (Rural Residential, minimum lot size 2.5 acres). Solar facilities are a permitted use with a Conditional Use Permit in this zone. The northern half of Site 1 is currently designated as NU and is zoned RR-2.5 and would not require a general plan amendment or zone change in order to allow the proposed project to move forward. The proposed projects will be in compliance with the City-adopted UBC (see Item VI.a) and erosion control requirements (Item VI.b). With approval of the GPA and ZC, the proposed projects would be in compliance with all applicable plans and impacts would be less than significant.

c. As noted under Item IV.e-f., the project sites are not subject to and would not conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

XI. a-b. The project sites do not contain any current mining or recovery operations for mineral resources and no such activities have occurred on the project sites in the past. According to the LMEA (Figure 2-4 and page 2-8), the project sites are not designated as Mineral Reserve 3 (contains potential but presently unproved resources). However, it is not considered likely that the Lancaster area has large, valuable mineral and aggregate deposits. Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources would occur.

XII. a, b, d. The City's General Plan (Table 3-1) establishes an outdoor maximum CNEL of 65 dBA for rural and residential uses. The current noise level in the area around Site 1 is approximately 50.4 dBA on Avenue H between 60$^{th}$ Street West and 70$^{th}$ Street West, 43.4 dBA on Avenue G between 90$^{th}$ Street West and 100$^{th}$ Street West, and 47.9 dBA on 70$^{th}$ Street West between Avenue G and Avenue H The current noise level in the area around Site 2 is approximately 55.2 dBA on Avenue I between 60$^{th}$ Street West and 70$^{th}$ Street West and 52.7 dBA on 70$^{th}$ Street West between Avenue H and Avenue I. (LMEA Table 8-11) These are the western most readings available near the project sites. The loudest phases of construction would involve earth moving equipment and vibratory pile driving. The total construction time for each of the projects is estimated to be 9 months. The loudest phases of construction would occur over a portion of this 9 month period. Construction activities associated with earth-moving equipment and other construction machinery would temporarily increase noise levels for adjacent land uses. Noise levels would fluctuate depending upon construction activity, equipment type and duration of use, and the distance between noise source and receiver.

The closest noise sensitive receptor to Site 1 is the Del Sur Elementary School located immediately adjacent to the south and east of the project site and the single family residences to the east of the project site along Avenue G. The closest noise sensitive receptors to Site 2 are the single family residences located approximately a quarter mile from the site. Construction noise from Site 2 is not likely to be noticeable at any of the sensitive receptors. However, noise levels at the elementary school may reach between 75 dBA and 85 dBA depending upon the location of the work and the type of equipment being utilized. These noise levels could cause interference with conversations or other normal daytime activities. However, the developer has been working with the school to ensure that interruptions during

class time are minimized. Additionally, the mitigation measures identified below apply to both project sites and would reduce noise impacts to a less than significant level.

9. Construction operations shall not occur between 8 p.m. and 7 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday or at any time on Sunday. The hours of any construction-related activities shall be restricted to periods and days permitted by local ordinance.

10. The on-site construction supervisor shall have the responsibility and authority to receive and resolve noise complaints. A clear appeal process to the owner shall be established prior to construction commencement that will allow for resolution of noise problems that cannot be immediately solved by the site supervisor.

11. Electrically powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, where feasible.

12. Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking and maintenance areas shall be located as far away as practicable from noise-sensitive receptors.

13. The use of noise producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells shall be for safety warning purposes only.

14. No project-related public address of music system shall be audible at any adjacent receptor.

15. All noise producing construction equipment and vehicles using internal combustion engines shall be equipped with mufflers, air-inlet silencers where appropriate, and any other shrouds, shields, or other noise-reducing features in good operating condition that meet or exceed original factory specifications. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors, etc.) shall be equipped with shrouds and noise control features that are readily available for the type of equipment.

With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts from construction noise would be less than significant.

c. Operation of the proposed projects would generate very minimal noise levels. The photovoltaic solar electric generating facility would generate electricity with PV panels mounted on fixed or slow moving, silently rotating trackers. A handful of employees would be necessary to run the proposed projects with most of the work being done remotely. Periodic maintenance would primarily consist of cleaning the PV panels, as necessary, and vegetation removal. Because of the passive nature of the on-site operations, the likelihood of noise disturbance at the neighboring receptors is minimal. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e-f. The project sites are not in proximity to an airport or frequent overflight area and would not experience noise from these sources (also see Item VIII.e-f). Therefore, no impacts would occur.

XIII. a. The proposed projects consist of the construction and operation of two photovoltaic solar electric generating facilities which would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth. The construction of the proposed projects is anticipated to employ a total of 250 individuals, most of who would come from the local area. Site 1 is expected to employ 100 individuals and Site 2 is expected to employ 150 individuals. Operation of the proposed projects would occur remotely with occasional

maintenance needs being handled by a handful of people. While the facilities would generate additional power to go into the grid, it would be helping to achieve the State mandates that require power companies to get 33% of their electricity from renewable sources by 2020. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

b-c. The northern half of Site 1 contains a farmhouse complex with a single family residence occupied by the owner of the property. This residence would be demolished by the proposed project. However, the property owner voluntarily leased the property to the applicant/developer and it is assumed that they have other living arrangements in place. The remainder of Site 1 and all of Site 2 are currently vacant. No housing or people would be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

XIV. The proposed projects would incrementally increase the need for fire and police services; however, the project sites are within the current service area of both these agencies and the additional time and cost to service the sites is minimal. The proposed projects would not induce substantial population growth and therefore, would not substantially increase demand on parks or other public facilities. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

Development of the proposed projects would not result in an incremental increase in population and would not increase the number of students in either the Antelope Valley Union High School District of the Westside School District. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

XV. a-b. The proposed projects involve the construction and operation of two solar power generating facilities. As discussed in Item XIV.a, it is anticipated that a maximum of 250 individuals would be employed for construction between the two projects. These workers are expected to come from the local area and would not create an additional demand on recreational facilities. Once the proposed projects are operational, most of the operations would be handled remotely and would not generate employees who would potentially be utilizing recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts to recreational facilities would occur and no construction of new facilities would be necessary.

XVI. a. The proposed projects would generate construction traffic in the form of worker vehicles and delivery trucks. These trips would only occur during construction and would most likely occur at off-peak hours of the day. Adequate access to the project sites exists to handle the trips that construction would generate. Most of the activities associated with operation of the proposed projects would be handled remotely. Occasional maintenance activities would be required and it is anticipated that at most approximately 1-2 trips per week would occur. This number of trips would not impact the surrounding street system. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b. There are no county congestion management agency designated roads or highways in the vicinity of the project sites. No impacts would occur.

c. The project sites do not contain any aviation related uses and the proposed projects would not include the development of any aviation related uses. The proposed projects are photovoltaic projects and the panels are designed to absorb light, not reflect it. Therefore, the proposed projects would not interfere with small aircraft flying overhead. Thus, the proposed projects would not have an impact on air traffic patterns.

d. No roadway improvements are required for the development of Site 1. A 30-foot wide paved access would be provided to Site 2 from Avenue I. This paved access would be installed to City

development standards and would be placed at the location of the future 100th Street West. No hazardous conditions would be created and no impacts would occur.

e. Site 1 would have adequate emergency access from 90th Street West and Avenue G and Site 2 would have adequate emergency access from Avenue I via a 30-foot paved access road. Interior circulation would be provided in accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles County Fire Department; therefore, no impacts would occur.

f. The proposed projects do not conflict with or impede any of the General Plan policies or specific actions related to alternative modes of transportation (Lancaster General Plan pgs. 5-18 to 5-24). Therefore, no impacts would occur.

XVII. a. The proposed projects would not generate any wastewater that would be disposed of in a sewer or septic system. Some wastewater would be generated from the occasional washing of the solar panels. This water would be disposed of on-site in accordance with any requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. As no hazardous materials would be utilized on-site, the wastewater is not expected to exceed any established standards. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b. No wastewater would be generated by the proposed projects. The sites would not be connected to the sanitary sewer system and there would be no septic system on-site. Therefore, no construction of new water or wastewater facilities would be required and no impacts would occur.

c. See Items IX.c and IX.d.

d. The proposed projects have minimal needs for water as there will be no employees routinely on the project sites and no structures which would be occupied by individuals are proposed. The only water needs the proposed projects have are for the occasional washing of solar panels. It is estimated that the operation of Site 1 would require approximately 1 acre-foot of water a year or approximately 325,825 gallons. Site 2 would require approximately 2 acre-feet of water a year or approximately 651,704 gallons. This water will either come from existing wells on the project sites or will be trucked in.

The proposed projects are not subject to the requirements of Senate Bill (SB) 610 as they do not meet the definition of a project under Section 10912 of the California Water Code. Under this section of the Water Code, a project is defined as any of the following:

- A proposed residential development of more than 500 dwelling units.
- A proposed shopping center or business establishment employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 500,000 square feet of floor space.
- A proposed commercial office building employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 250,000 feet of floor space.
- A proposed hotel or motel, or both, having more than 500 rooms.
- A proposed industrial, manufacturing, or processing plant, or industrial park planned to house more than 1,000 persons, occupying more than 40 acres of land, or having more than 650,000 square feet of floor area.
- A mixed-use project that includes one or more of the projects specified in this subdivision.

- A project that would demand an amount of water equivalent to, or greater than, the amount of water required by a 500 dwelling unit project.

The proposed projects are not residential, commercial, industrial, manufacturing, processing, or mixed use and do not employ more than a 1,000 people. The proposed projects are electric generating facilities (utilities). Additionally, the proposed projects would not use the same amount or more of water than 500 single family homes. As described above, the two projects combined would utilize approximately 3 acre-feet a year, which is equivalent to the yearly water utilized by 3 single family homes. No new or expanded entitlements would be necessary. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e. See Item XVII.b.

f-g. The proposed projects would generate solid waste during construction which would contribute to an overall impact on landfill services (GPEIR pgs 5.13-25 to 5.13-28 and 5.13-31); although the project's contribution would be minimal. During operation of the projects, no solid waste would be generated for disposal in the landfill. All materials generated by the repair of equipment would be recycled by appropriate facilities. Therefore, no trash collection services would be necessary and impacts would be less than significant.

XVIII.a-c. Other solar projects have been approved or are undergoing review in the City of Lancaster and in the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. These projects, if constructed, would result in a large number of acres being converted to solar generating facilities which could generate cumulative impacts. Most of the impacts generated by these projects are site specific and generally do not influence the impacts on another site. Additionally, all projects undergo environmental and have required mitigation measures to reduce impacts when warranted.

The AVAQMD is in nonattainment for ozone and $PM_{10}$. The proposed projects would not exceed the thresholds established by the District with the implementation of the mitigation measure for Site 2 (see Item III.b). The AVAQMD does not have a numerical threshold by which to compare construction or operational emissions for multiple projects. The single project threshold is in essence a cumulative threshold. If a single project exceeds the project specific threshold, then it would also have a cumulative impact. Therefore, if construction of the two projects were to occur at the same time, it is not likely to result in a significant cumulative impact. However, construction of the proposed projects is expected to occur consecutively no simultaneously. Therefore, cumulative construction air quality impacts would be less than significant.

Operation of the proposed projects would reduce cumulative $NO_x$ emissions more than what is shown in Item III.b. A combined cycle gas turbine facility would emit over 8 tons of $NO_x$ per year to generate the equivalent amount of electricity to be generated by the proposed projects. This would more than offset all construction $NO_x$ emissions; however, power generation emissions that are offset may or may occur in this air basin. In 10 years, the proposed projects would reduce $NO_x$ by 80 tons. Therefore, cumulative operational air quality impacts would be less than significant.

Construction of the solar projects throughout the Antelope Valley would lead to a cumulative loss of habitat for a variety of plants and animals. The project sites contain suitable habitat for burrowing owls and foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk which would be lost as a result of implementing the proposed projects. Mitigation measures have been identified to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. As such, the proposed projects' contribution to cumulative impacts with respect to biological resources would not be cumulatively considerable. Additionally, the City requires the payment of a

biological impact fee to address the cumulative loss of biological resources within the Antelope Valley. This fee is put in to a separate account which is utilized to acquire conservation habitat.

Mitigation measures are required to reduce noise impacts to the nearby sensitive receptors. Two approved solar projects are located south and southeast of Site 1. One solar project is located on the southwest corner of 90th Street West and Avenue H (CUP 11-03) and the other is located on the southeast corner of 90th Street West and Avenue H (CUP 10-22). Immediately east of Site 2, is an approved solar development (CUP 10-03) which has started construction. The same mitigation measures are required of all of the projects in order to ensure that noise impacts are less than significant. It is not anticipated that construction of any of the projects would occur at the same time. Therefore, construction noise impacts would not cumulatively considerable. All other mitigation measures that were identified are a statement of regulatory requirements. Therefore, any potential cumulative impacts are less than significant and would not be cumulatively considerable.

List of Referenced Documents and Available Locations*:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| AQ1: | Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Report, Summer Solar Generating Facility Project, City of Lancaster, California, Michael Brandman Associates, July 25, 2012 | PD |
| AQ2: | Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Report, Springtime Solar Generating Facility Project, City of Lancaster, California, Michael Brandman Associates, August 3, 2012 | PD |
| BRR1: | Biological Technical Report for the Summer Solar Project Site (2-84), City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California, Chambers Group, Inc., April 2012 | PD |
| BRR2: | Biological Technical Report for the Minna Greenworks and Summer Solar Project Sites, City of Lancaster, Los Angeles, County, CA, Chambers Group, Inc., July 2012 | PD |
| BRR3: | Biological Technical Report for the Springtime Solar Project Site (2-85), City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California, Chambers Group, Inc., April 2012 | PD |
| CRS1: | Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of Silverado Power's Proposed Summer Solar Generating Facility Project, CUP #2-84, APN #3219-017-019, City of Lancaster, California, Michael Brandman Associates, April 25, 2012 | PD |
| CRS2: | Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of Silverado Power's Proposed Minna Greenworks Solar Generating Facility, AIN #3219-016-003, City of Lancaster, California, Michael Brandman Associates, July 23, 2012 | PD |
| CRS 3: | Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of Silverado Power's Proposed Springtime Solar Generating Facility Project, CUP (2-85), APN #3265-021-001, -002, -003, -004, City of Lancaster, California, Michael Brandman Associates, April 25, 2012 | PD |
| ESA1: | Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Summer Solar Project (2-84), Lancaster, California, Tetra Tech EC Inc., April 2012 | PD |
| ESA2: | Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Minna Greenworks Solar Generation Facility, Lancaster, California, Tetra Tech EC, Inc., July 2012 | PD |
| ESA3: | Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Springtime Solar Project (2-85), Lancaster, California, Tetra Tech EC, Inc., April 2012 | PD |
| FIRM: | Flood Insurance Rate Map | PW |
| GPEIR: | Lancaster General Plan Environmental Impact Report | PD |
| ITE: | Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual, 7th Edition | PW |
| LGP: | Lancaster General Plan | PD |
| LMC: | Lancaster Municipal Code | PD |
| LMEA: | Lancaster Master Environmental Assessment | PD |
| SSHZ: | State Seismic Hazard Zone Maps | PD |
| USGS: | United States Geological Survey Maps | PD |
| USDA SCS: | United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Maps | PD |

* PD: Planning Department
PW: Department of Public Works
Lancaster City Hall
44933 Fern Avenue
Lancaster, California 93534