

RESOLUTION NO. 15-52

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA, AMENDING THE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTY FROM UR (URBAN RESIDENTIAL), NU (NON-URBAN RESIDENTIAL), AND C (COMMERCIAL) WITH A SPECIFIC PLAN (SP) OVERLAY DESIGNATION TO NU

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 3.c of the City Council Resolution No. 93-07, an amendment to the adopted General Plan of the City has been initiated by Sustainable Power (sPower) Group, LLC, to re-designate a total of 960± acres of a 1,191-acre site from a combination of Non-Urban Residential (NU), Urban Residential (UR), and Commercial (C) with Specific Plan (SP) overlay, to NU; and

WHEREAS, notice of intention to consider the General Plan amendment was given as required in 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 request be approved; and

WHEREAS, a public notice was provided as required by law, and a public hearing on the General Plan Amendment was held by the City Council on September 8, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a legally noticed public hearing on July 20, 2015, certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and adopting all necessary California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) findings for the project with the finding that the project and associated General Plan amendment and zone change would not create any significant environmental impacts with incorporation of the identified mitigation measures; further, the Planning Commission voted to recommend to the City Council approval of General Plan Amendment No. 14-02; and

WHEREAS, this Council, based on evidence in the record, hereby adopts the following findings in support of approval of General Plan Amendment No. 14-02:

1. There is a need for the proposed land use designation of NU (Non-Urban Residential) on the project site in order to allow for development of a cohesive, larger scaled, distributed generation solar energy facility.
2. The proposed designation of NU will be compatible with the existing land use designations of NU and Heavy Agricultural (Los Angeles County) primarily surrounding the project site.

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 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 3.6.6 “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 new City services.
7. The proposed amendment would reduce the demand on the groundwater as compared to development of the project site with residential and commercial uses under the current urban residential/commercial/specific plan designations.
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 Final EIR. Upon completion of construction, minimal amounts of traffic associated with occasional maintenance operations would be generated, and minimal traffic impacts would occur. A mitigation measure requiring a traffic management plan during construction is required to ensure traffic impacts are less than significant.
10. The proposed amendment and subsequent construction of the solar photovoltaic facility would create environmental impacts as discussed in the Final EIR. Potential impacts with respect to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology, noise, and traffic would be created as a result of construction activities. Mitigation measures are required, which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. No significant impacts would occur with operation of the facility.

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER AS FOLLOWS:

The City Council hereby approves General Plan Amendment No. 14-02 to redesignate the subject property from NU, Urban Residential, and C with Specific SP overlay, to NU.

PASSED, APPROVED and ADOPTED this _____ day of _____, 2015, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

BRITT AVRIT, CMC
City Clerk
City of Lancaster

R. REX PARRIS
Mayor
City of Lancaster

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)
 CITY OF LANCASTER) ss

CERTIFICATION OF RESOLUTION
 CITY COUNCIL

I, _____, _____ City
 of Lancaster, California, do hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of the original
 Resolution No. 15-52, 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 _____, _____.

(seal)

ORDINANCE NO. 1005

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER,
CALIFORNIA, REZONING THE SUBJECT PROPERTY
FROM SP (SPECIFIC PLAN) TO RR-2.5 (RURAL
RESIDENTIAL, ONE DWELLING UNIT PER 2.5 ACRES)

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 17.24.060 of the Municipal Code, a request has been filed by Sustainable Power (sPower) Group, LLC, to change the zoning designation on 960± acres of land generally bounded by Avenue K, 80th Street West, 105th Street West, and the California Aqueduct from SP (Specific Plan) 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 July 20, 2015, and the City Council on September 8, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed and certified the Final EIR 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 Findings contained in Exhibit "A" and the mitigation measures in Exhibit "B" of Planning Commission Resolution No. 15-12;

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

1. The proposed Zone Change from SP 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 project site's General Plan land use designation to provide for a suitable alternative energy site, warrant a revision in the zoning for the subject property which would allow the development of a photovoltaic solar electric generating facility.
3. A need for the proposed zone classification of RR-2.5 exists within the area in order to allow for the development of cohesive, larger scale, distributive generation solar energy facilities. 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 larger scale 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 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.

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

Section 1. That the subject property is reclassified from SP 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, Britt Avrit, 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 _____, 2015, and placed upon its second reading and adoption at a regular meeting of the City Council on the _____ day of _____, 2015 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

BRITT AVRIT, CMC
City Clerk
City of Lancaster

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.
1005, 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)

EXHIBIT "A"

***FINDINGS AND FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS FOR
THE LANCASTER ENERGY CENTER
(GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 14-02, ZONE CHANGE 14-02, AND CONDITIONAL
USE PERMIT 14-10 [14-10A, 14-10B, 14-10C, 14-10D, AND 14-10E])
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 14-01
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER 2014071077***

1. INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code Section 21081, and the State CEQA Guidelines, 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15091 requires that a public agency consider the environmental impacts of a project before a project is approved and make specific findings. CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 provides:

- (a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:
 1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.
 2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
 3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the final EIR.
- (b) The findings required by subsection (a) shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.
- (c) The finding in subsection (a)(2) shall not be made if the agency making the finding has concurrent jurisdiction with another agency to deal with identified feasible mitigation measures or alternatives. The findings in subsection (a)(3) shall describe the specific reasons for rejecting identified mitigation measures and project alternatives.
- (d) When making the findings required in subsection (a)(1), the agency shall also adopt a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes which it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.

- (e) The public agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other materials which constitute the record of the proceedings upon which its decision is based.
- (f) A statement made pursuant to Section 15093 does not substitute for the findings required by this section.

Having received, reviewed and considered the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Lancaster Energy Center, dated July 2015 (“FEIR”), which includes but is not limited to the Draft Environmental Impact Report (“DEIR”), Responses to Comments on the DEIR, and all other information in the record of proceedings on this matter, the following Findings and Facts in Support of Findings (“Findings”) are hereby adopted by the City of Lancaster (“City”) in its capacity as the CEQA Lead Agency. These Findings set forth the City’s environmental basis for approval of General Plan Amendment 14-02, Zone Change 14-02, and Conditional Use Permit 14-10 (consisting of CUPs 14-10a, b, c, d, and e) (“proposed project”).

A. Format

These Findings have been organized into the following sections:

- (1) Section 1 provides an introduction to these Findings.
- (2) Section 2 provides a summary of the project and overview of the discretionary actions required for approval of the project, and a statement of the project’s objectives.
- (3) Section 3 provides a summary of the environmental review conducted in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines by the City for the project and a summary of public participation in the environmental review for the project.
- (4) Section 4 sets forth findings regarding those environmental impacts which were determined as a result of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) and consideration of comments received during the NOP comment period either not to be relevant to the project or which were determined to clearly not manifest at levels which were deemed to be significant for consideration at the project-specific level.
- (5) Section 5 sets forth findings regarding significant or potentially significant environmental impacts identified in the FEIR which the City has determined are either not significant or can feasibly be mitigated to a less than significant level through the imposition of mitigation measures. In order to ensure compliance and implementation, all of these measures will be included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the project. Section 5 also includes findings regarding those significant or potentially significant environmental impacts identified in the FEIR which will or which may result from the project and which the City has determined cannot feasibly be mitigated to a less than significant level.
- (6) Section 6 sets forth finding regarding alternatives to the proposed project.
- (7) Section 7 consists of a Statement of Overriding Considerations which sets forth the City’s reasons for finding the specific economic, legal, social, technological,

and other considerations associated with the project outweigh the project's potential unavoidable environmental effects.

B. Custodian and Location of Records

The documents and other materials which constitute the administrative record for the City's actions related to the project are located at the City of Lancaster, Development Services Department, 44933 Fern Avenue, Lancaster, California 93534. The Community Development Division is the custodian of the administrative record for the project.

2. PROJECT SUMMARY

A. Discretionary Actions

These Findings set for the environmental basis for current discretionary actions to be undertaken by the City for the approval of the project. These actions include approval of General Plan Amendment No. 14-02, Zone Change 14-02, and Conditional Use Permit Nos. 14-10A, 14-10B, 14-10C, 14-10D, and 14-10E (collectively known as CUP 14-10).

B. Project Location

The project site is located in the Antelope Valley in the northern portion of Los Angeles County, completely within the City of Lancaster. All of the gen-tie routes, with the exception of Gen-tie Route 2, are located partially within unincorporated Los Angeles County. The project site consists of approximately 1,191 acres and is generally bounded by Avenue K, 105th Street West, 80th Street West, and the California Aqueduct. The proposed project encompasses the following assessor's parcel numbers: 3248-009-001 thru -002; 3248-010-002, -005, -006, -007, -012, -063; 3248-011-002, -004, -005, -006, -007, -016, -017, -018, -019, -025, -026, -032, -033, -034, -035; 3248-012-001, -002, -004, -007, -008, -009, -010, -011, -012, -013, -014, -015, -018, -019, -020, -021, -022, -023, -025, -026, -027; 3248-013-001, -002, -003; 3248-021-001, -002, -003, -004, -005, -006, -007, -008, -009, -011, -013, -014, -015, -016, -019, -020, -021, -025, -026, -027, -031, -032, -033, -034, -035, -036, -037, -038, -040, -045, -046, -047, -048, -049, -051, -052, -053; and 3248-022-001.

C. Project Description

The proposed project consists of the construction and operation of a 150 megawatt (MW) solar electricity generating facility and up to two gen-tie lines that would feed power to one of two switching stations, ultimately connecting to a previously approved collector substation near 100th Street West and Avenue J. The energy generated by the proposed project would potentially be interconnected to Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) infrastructure. The City's zoning ordinance allows solar facilities on property zoned RR-2.5 (rural residential, minimum lot size 2.5 acres) with a conditional use permit. The project site is designated by the City's General Plan as a mix of NU (Non-Urban), UR (Urban Residential), and C (Commercial) and is zoned RR-2.5 and SP (Specific Plan). As such the applicant has requested a general plan amendment/zone change to change the designation on the entire site to NU and the zoning to RR-2.5.

The proposed project would be constructed in phases and operated for a period of at least 35 years. The proposed project would consist of the following elements: photovoltaic (PV) modules, module mounting system, electrical inverters and transformers, electrical alternating current collection system, including switchgear, data monitoring equipment, transmission and gen-tie lines, and access roads and security fencing. The solar field would consist of single-axis tracking or fixed-tilt systems laid out in a common PV block design to allow for sufficient access. A series of PV module arrays would be mounted on racking systems supported by a vibratory-driven foundation design. The modules would be oriented toward the south and angled at a degree that would optimize solar resource efficiency. For the single-axis tracking configuration, the modules would rotate from east to west over the course of the day. 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. Inverters would be consolidated in areas to minimize cable routing, trenching, and electrical losses. The final output from the facility would be processed through a transformer to match the interconnection voltage. All electrical inverters, transformers, and gear would be placed on concrete foundation structures. From there, the output of the 34.5 kilovolt (kV) transformers would be collected onto common 34.5 kV feeders.

The 34.5 kV feeders would utilize gen-tie routes constructed either overhead or underground to feed power to the onsite switching station, ultimately connecting to a previously approved collector substation near 100th Street West and Avenue J, and routed to the Antelope Valley Substation for use by SCE. Redundant fiber optic cables would also be routed underground between the collector substation and Antelope Valley Substation for use by SCE.

Additionally, the proposed project has the potential to interconnect with LADWP's Barren Ridge- Rinaldi 230 kV transmission line at one of the following locations: 1) near the intersection of Avenue J and 130th Street West; 2) Avenue I and 125th Street West; or 3) Avenue G and 120th Street West. The proposed project would connect to a newly constructed LADWP switching station via an overhead or underground gen-tie (up to 230kV) from the project site. The new 230 kV switching station would be owned and operated by LADWP.

D. Project Objectives

The following objectives have been established for the proposed project:

- Support the efforts of City of Lancaster and State of California to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions consistent with the timeline established by California Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.
- Assist the State of California in complying with Executive Order (EO) S-21-09 and California utilities in meeting their obligations under California's Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) Program to be fully online by 2016.
- Support the energy goals stated in the City of Lancaster General Plan 2030, as well as other policies in the plan designed to protect City of Lancaster's environment and economy.

- Minimize impacts to threatened or endangered species or their habitats, wetlands and waters of the United States and the State of California, cultural resources, and sensitive land uses.
- Provide an investment in California and the City of Lancaster that would create jobs and other economic benefits.
- Develop an economically feasible and commercially financeable project.
- Maximize the use of existing transmission infrastructure while minimizing the network upgrade costs borne by the California ratepayer.
- Ensure that the proposed project can be technologically constructed in a manner that allows electricity to be provided at a competitive price.
- Develop a facility that is situated in a California Renewable Energy Zone close to existing electrical infrastructure or transmission lines.

3. **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The environmental review process for the proposed project is summarized as follows:

On July 23, 2014, the City issued a Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) for the proposed project in accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines; publication of the Notice of Preparation occurred in the Antelope Valley Press on August 4, 2014. The NOP was circulated for a period of thirty (30) days, and a scoping meeting was held on August 14, 2014 in the Community Room at American Heroes Park. The NOP comment period ended on August 22, 2014. The NOP was filed with the State Clearinghouse on July 24, 2014. The NOP is included in the DEIR as Appendix A. The responses to the NOP are included in Appendix A.

The DEIR was made available and distributed to agencies, interested organizations and individuals by the City for public review on April 15, 2015. The forty-five day comment period was provided from April 15, 2015 to May 29, 2015. The Notice of Availability of a Draft EIR was published in the Antelope Valley Press on April 16 and April 18, 2015. A public hearing was held before the Planning Commission on May 18, 2015, during which opportunity was provided to give oral and written comments on the DEIR. Comments received during the public review period for the DEIR were responded to in the Responses to Comments which was included in the FEIR, dated July 10, 2015. The FEIR was distributed to agencies submitting comments on July 10, 2015.

The following documents comprise the FEIR for the project:

- Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Lancaster Energy Center, dated April 15, 2015 including applicable revisions;
- Comments received on the DEIR and responses to those comments, published in the FEIR, dated July 10, 2015; and
- All analysis, attachments, incorporated documents, and references to the documents identified and referenced in the DEIR and FEIR, and submitted to the City as part of the EIR process.

The City Planning Commission considered the FEIR and the project at its hearing on July 20, 2015 for approval of the considered use permit and to make a recommendation to the City Council on the general plan amendment and zone change. The City Council will consider the general plan amendment and zone change at its hearing on August 11, 2015.

4. **ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH WERE DETERMINED TO NOT BE POTENTIALLY AFFECTED BY THE PROJECT**

As a result of the NOP circulated by the City beginning on July 23, 2014, the City determined, based upon the threshold criteria for significance, that the proposed project would have no impact on the following potential environmental effects, and therefore, determined that these potential environmental effects would not be addressed in the DEIR. Based upon the environmental analysis presented in the FEIR, and the comments received from the public on the DEIR, no substantial evidence has been submitted to or identified by the City which indicates that the proposed project would have no impact on the following environmental issues, and therefore, no additional analysis beyond what was provided is necessary.

1. Agriculture and Forestry Resources: The following issues were not analyzed in the Draft EIR for the reasons identified below:
 - *Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in PRC Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by PRC Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))* – The project site is not zoned as forest land, timberland, or timberland production and does not meet the requirements of a timberland zone as defined by PRC Section 4526. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the rezoning of forest land or timberland and no impacts would occur. No further analysis of this issue is required.
 - *Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use* – There are no forests within the City of Lancaster. The project site consists of former agricultural lands or undeveloped desert. Therefore, no potential impacts associated with the loss or conversion of forest land would occur. No further analysis of this issue is required.
2. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases: The following issue was not analyzed in the Draft EIR for the reason identified below:
 - *Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people* – Solar facilities are not sources of objectionable odors. Construction activities would result in equipment exhaust odors that may be considered objectionable by some; however, there are few sensitive receptors in the immediate vicinity and construction activities would be temporary. Therefore, impacts associated with creating objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people would be less than significant. No further analysis of this issue is required.
3. Biological Resources: The following issue was not analyzed in the Draft EIR for the reason identified below:

- *Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State Habitat Conservation Plan* – There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or State Habitat Conservation Plans that are applicable to the project site. Therefore, no potential impacts would occur with respect to the proposed project conflicting with the provisions of adopted plans. No further analysis of this issue is required.
4. Geology and Soils: The following issue was not analyzed in the Draft EIR for the reason identified below:
- *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*– The proposed project would not generate waste water that would need to be disposed of in a septic or sewer system. During construction and maintenance operations, portable restroom facilities would be provided for workers. Therefore, no potential impacts with respect to waste water disposal systems would occur.
5. Hazards and Hazardous Materials: The following issues were not analyzed in the Draft EIR for the reasons identified below:
- *Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school* – Solar facilities do not emit hazardous emissions; however, construction activities would include the use of hazardous materials such as gasoline, diesel, and solvents. The closest school to the project site is Quartz Hill High School, located at 6040 West Avenue L. This school is approximately 2 miles east of the project site. As such, the proposed project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, no potential impacts associated with emission of hazardous materials or substances within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school would occur.
 - *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* – The project site is not located within two miles of an airport. The nearest airport is the William J Fox Airfield, located approximately 4 miles northeast of the project site. Therefore, no potential impacts associated with aviation safety hazards at the project site would occur.
 - *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard to people residing or working in the project area* – The project site is not located within two miles of a public or private airport or airstrip. The nearest airport is the William J Fox Airfield, located approximately 4 miles northeast of the project site. Therefore, no potential impacts associated with aviation safety hazards at the project site would occur.

6. Hydrology and Water Quality: The following issue was not analyzed in the Draft EIR for the reason identified below:
- *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* – The proposed project does not involve the construction of any habitable structures, including housing. Therefore, no potential impacts with respect to placing housing within a 100-year flood hazard area would occur.
7. Land Use Planning, Population and Housing: The following issues were not analyzed in the Draft EIR for the reasons identified below:
- *Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan* – There are no Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans that are applicable to the project site. Therefore, no potential impacts would occur with respect to the proposed project conflicting with the provision of these plans.
 - *Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? Or, displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere*– The project site does not contain any residential uses and no residential uses are included as part of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to displace people or housing and would not require the construction of housing elsewhere.
8. Mineral Resources: The following issue was not analyzed in the Draft EIR for the reason identified below:
- *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? Or, 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* – The project site does not contain any known mineral deposits or active mineral extraction operations. The City of Lancaster and the project site, are not considered likely to have large, valuable mineral and aggregate deposits according to the City of Lancaster General Plan 2030 Master Environmental Assessment. This condition precludes the possibility of the loss of important mineral resources as a result of project construction and operation.
9. Noise: The following issues were not analyzed in the Draft EIR for the reasons identified below:
- *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* – The project site is not located within two miles of an airport. The nearest airport is the William J Fox Airfield, located

approximately 4 miles northeast of the project site. Therefore, no potential impacts associated with aviation noise at the project site would occur.

- *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* – The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The nearest airport is the William J Fox Airfield, located approximately 4 miles northeast of the project site. Therefore, no potential impacts associated with aviation noise at the project site would occur.

5. **FINDINGS ON POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT IDENTIFIED IN THE DEIR**

The following potentially significant environmental impacts were analyzed in the DEIR:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture
- Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use, Population and Housing
- Noise
- Public Services, Utilities, Service Systems, and Recreation
- Transportation and Traffic

Where as a result of the environmental analysis of the proposed project and the identification of project design features, compliance with existing laws, codes and statutes, and the identification of feasible mitigation measures, the following potentially significant impacts have been determined by the City to be reduced to a level of less than significant, the City has found in accordance with CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1) that “Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment,” which is referred to herein as “Finding 1.” Where the potential impact can be reduced to less than significant solely through adherence to and implementation of project design features or standard conditions, these measures are considered “incorporated into the project” which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant effect, and in these situations, the City also will make “Finding 1” even though no mitigation measures are required, but will find that the potential impact has been reduced to Less Than Significant through either project design features incorporated into the project or adherence to standard conditions.

Where the City has determined pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(2) that “Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency, the City’s finding is referred to herein as “Finding 2”.

Where, as a result of the environmental analysis of the proposed project, the City has determined that either (1) even with the identification of project design features, compliance with existing laws, codes and statutes, and/or the identification of feasible mitigation measures, potentially significant impacts cannot be reduced to a level of less than significant, or (2) no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives are available to mitigate the potentially significant impact, the City has found in accordance with CEQA Section 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3) that “Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report,” referred to herein as “Finding 3.”

In making these findings, the City has relied upon the environmental conclusions reached by experts that prepared the FEIR, including the information, analysis and conclusions in the technical reports prepared and made a part of the FEIR. Although contrary opinions may have been presented in comments submitted on the DEIR and FEIR, the City has weighed those comments against the underlying data, analysis and conclusions in the FEIR, and has reached its conclusions accordingly.

A. AESTHETICS

The thresholds of significance for aesthetic impacts are listed in Section 3.1 on page 3.1-14 of the FEIR.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project’s potential to impact a scenic vista.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.1-15 and 3.1-16 of the Draft EIR, and depicted in the visual simulations provided on pages 3.1-6 through 3.1-11 (Figures 3.1-1 through 3.1-6), the proposed project would introduce solar arrays, collection lines, access roads, and six to eight feet high chain-link perimeter fencing with landscaping into views of residents, workers, and recreationists in the surrounding area and utilizing local roadways. The specific details and components of the proposed project are described in Section 2, Project Description. The project switching station and electrical components are shown in Figures 2-3 and 2-10.

Depending on the location, the panels would look like straight or staggered lines. At a significant distance, the array has a similar appearance to a water surface covering the hillsides. The terrain allows views of portions of the array yet obscures views of other portions. Fencing, landscaping and electrical generation infrastructure is not apparent when viewed from locations further away from the project site. They become more visible from locations closer to the project site such as residents along Avenue L.

The potential switching station(s) would introduce a number of structures visible onsite. The corridor would have similar visual impacts to surrounding property owners regardless of the ultimate gen-tie route selected. The switching station would include

breakers, switches, meters, and related equipment that would be surrounded by perimeter security fencing. These features would be visible because the switching station infrastructure would be taller than the solar panels and the terrain may provide elevated viewing points toward the specific switching station locations. Terrain, landscaping and existing structures would also help to obscure views of the switching station from other vantage points.

The proposed project has the potential to use one of six gen-tie routes, or a combination of routes, which would connect to the Antelope Substation and/or the LADWP Barren Ridge-Rinaldi transmission line. The proposed project would utilize steel or wooden poles similar to those currently in the vicinity of the project site to connect to these facilities. Additionally, a majority of the gen-tie routes will be located underground. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this would result in substantial visual changes affecting a scenic vista because of the small number of gen-tie line supporting structure and facilities, which would be designed in keeping with the existing visual character of the area.

None of the vantage points identified (see the above referenced figures) are considered to hold a moderate to high aesthetic value. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on scenic vistas and no mitigation measures are required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to impact scenic resources within a State scenic highway and further finds that no significant impacts will result from the project and no mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.1-17 of the Draft EIR, the project site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a State Scenic Highway. No views of the project site are available from Highway 2, the closest State Scenic Highway. Therefore, no impacts to scenic resources along a State Scenic Highway would occur. Drivers along locally designated scenic roadways may be able to see portions of the proposed project following construction, but impacts to scenic views of the surrounding mountains and deserts would not be substantially adverse and views of the proposed project from these roadways would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the vicinity. Mature trees that exist in the area are not designated as scenic resources. No impacts to scenic resources would occur and no mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would substantially degrade the existing visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to degrade the visual character and quality of the project site and surroundings.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.1-17 and 3.1-19 of the Draft EIR, the construction and operation of the proposed project would change the visual

character of the project site by introducing solar arrays and associated facilities and infrastructure that would be visible to residences, workers, and roadway travelers. The details of the proposed project are described in Section 2, Project Description, and Section 3.1, Aesthetics. The project site is located in close proximity to the Antelope Substation and several other solar facilities, transmission lines, and other associated infrastructure. The rolling terrain would make the linear pattern of the array more pronounced, compared to installation on level ground, because viewers would be able to clearly see the array pattern on the undulating terrain. The changes to the existing visual character resulting from project operations and maintenance would reduce the vividness, intactness, and unity to be moderately low and result in an overall visual quality that is low. Although the facility would be located in a predominantly rural area, there is still the potential to impact residential viewers in close proximity to the project site. This would result in potentially significant impacts to the visual character of the project site. Mitigation measures AES-1 through AES-3 were identified to reduce these impacts. Mitigation Measures AES-1 and AES-2 would require landscaping to be installed and enhanced landscaping along Avenue L near the existing residences. Mitigation measure AES-3 would require the painting of the water tanks so that they blend in with the existing terrain. Implementation of these measures would reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to create substantial sources of light and glare.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.1-19 and 3.1-20 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would introduce new sources of light and glare. The project site is currently undeveloped and is devoid of light and glare sources. As described in Section 2, Project Description, and Section 3.1, Aesthetics, the proposed project would include inward facing, low-level security lighting at entry/egress gates which would be directed downward onto the project site and shielded to illuminate only intended areas. The project's switching station would be lit when staff is working at the site. These project components would reduce the amount of light trespass falling outside the boundaries of the project site.

The proposed project would introduce a new source of glare from the reflective surfaces of the solar panels which are designed to trap the incident rays of sunlight; however, any incident radiation not absorbed and transmitted would be reflected. Residents, recreationists, and roadway travelers in close proximity to the panels may experience some glare. Recreationists and roadway travelers would be transitory through the project area and the effects of glare on these viewers would last moments as they pass by the proposed project. The project site's gradual increase in terrain elevation may also help to limit glare from the proposed project by obscuring views of the panels, such as along West Avenue L-8 and 76th Street West.

Existing residences north and southeast of and within 1 mile of the project site have long-term, permanent views of the proposed site. The glare impact on these residences is expected to be less than significant because the PV arrays would be predominately obstructed by the site's rolling terrain, minimizing orientation to existing residences. Therefore, glare impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact with respect to scenic vistas, scenic resources along a State scenic highway, visual character, and light/glare.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential aesthetic impacts.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.1-20 and 3.1-21 visual resource impacts of the related projects are site specific and would not combine with other projects that are not in the same viewshed to create a cumulative impact. There are numerous projects (see Table 3-3 in Section 3.0 of the Draft EIR) that are in close proximity to the project site that a cumulative effect could potentially occur. However, all proposed and reasonably foreseeable projects would be subject to design and landscaping requirements to ensure that they do not degrade visual character. The proposed project would be required to implement landscaping and screening consistent with City design requirements and Mitigation Measures AES-1 through AES-3; therefore, the proposed project's aesthetic impacts are not cumulatively considerable. Impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the identified mitigation measures.

B. AGRICULTURE

The thresholds of significance for agricultural impacts are listed in Section 3.2 on pages 3.2-5 and 3.2-6 of the FEIR.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would convert Prime, Unique, or Important agricultural farmland to a non-agricultural use.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to convert agricultural farmland to a non-agricultural use.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.2-6 of the Draft EIR, the 1,191 acre project site is designated as Grazing Land by the California Department of Conservation (CDC), Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. The Grazing Land designation is not considered prime, unique or important agricultural farmland. As such, development of the project site would not result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use.

The potential switching station located at the end of Gen-tie Route 4 (near the intersection of Avenue J and 130th Street West) is designated as Farmland of Local Importance. In the event that this gen-tie route is selected in the final design, 3.67 acres of Farmland of Local Importance would be temporarily converted to non-agricultural

uses. According to the CDC, there are 5,671 acres of Farmland of Local Importance in Los Angeles County. As such the 3.67 acre switching station represents 0.06% of said farmland. Additionally, the conversion of farmland is not permanent; the land could be returned to an agricultural use at the end of the life of the proposed project. Therefore, impacts are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act contract.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.2-7 of the Draft EIR, the project site is not under a Williamson Act contract and there are no Williamson Act contracts located within the City of Lancaster. The City of Lancaster does not have agricultural zoning. However, the proposed project involves a general plan amendment and zone change to designate the entire site as UR and RR-2.5 which would allow for agricultural uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act contract. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.2-7 and 3.2-8 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would convert the project site to a utility scale solar facility. The proposed project has the potential to have limited indirect offsite impacts on agricultural lands by converting them to nonagricultural uses if Gen-tie Route 4 is selected in the final design. During operations, there would be a small amount of occasional traffic for maintenance activities which would not be higher than current traffic volumes. The number of employees at the project site during operation would be no more than six and would not result in a substantial new demand for housing and the resultant conversion of farmland. Therefore, impacts associated with conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural uses would be less than significant.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact with respect to agricultural resources (farmland conversion, zoning/Williamson Act contracts).

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to cumulatively impact agricultural resources.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.2-8 of the Draft EIR, and detailed on pages 3.2-6 through 3.2-8, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on agricultural resources. The proposed project could contribute to the ongoing loss of Farmland of Local Importance if Gen-tie Route 4 is selected. The potential loss of 3.67 acres of Farmland of Local Importance is not a significant impact given the total amount of this type of farmland in Los Angeles County. Given the limited size and type of agricultural lands within the project site, this would be a less than considerable contribution to the loss of agricultural land within the region. Cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

C. AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GASES

The thresholds of significance for air quality and greenhouse gas impacts are listed in Section 3.3 on page 3.3-18 of the DEIR.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to impact an applicable air quality plan.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.3-19 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would not result in any significant long-term changes in population or employment growth. As such, it would be considered consistent with growth projections in the City's General Plan, and employment and growth projections developed by SCAG. The proposed project would be consistent with current AVAQMD air quality plans and would comply with all AVAQMD rules and regulations. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project could potentially violate air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to generate air emissions that violate air quality standards.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.3-20 through 3.3-23 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would generate air emissions during construction and operation. These emissions are summarized in Tables 3.3-5 and 3.3-6 of the Draft EIR. As shown in these tables, both the construction and operational emissions would be below the annual (tons per year) and peak daily (pounds per day) quantitative thresholds established by the AVAQMD for criteria pollutants (carbon monoxide [CO], oxides of nitrogen [NO_x], volatile organic compounds [VOC], oxides of sulfur [SO_x], and particulate matter [PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}]). Mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-4 were identified to ensure that impacts from dust (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) would be less than significant. Therefore, air emissions from construction and operation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

As discussed on page 3.2-22, studies conducted that show that a heat island effect is unlikely to occur as a result of operation of the proposed project. It was determined in these studies that while the back surface of the solar panels is up to 30 degrees Celsius warmer than the ambient temperature, the air above the arrays is only 2.5 degrees Celsius warmer. This heat dissipates with height and night cooling and would not increase the ambient temperature in the surrounding vicinity.

Potential Impact: The proposed project could potentially 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).

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of O₃ and PM₁₀.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.3-24 and shown in Table 3.3-3 of the Draft EIR, the AVAQMD is in non-attainment for O₃, and PM₁₀. The proposed project would generate air emissions during construction and operational activities; however, these air emissions would be less than the annual or daily thresholds established by the AVAQMD. While these emissions are below the established thresholds, they could contribute to a cumulatively considerable net increase in emission levels. As such, implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-4 will ensure compliance with AVAQMD rules and regulations and applicable air quality plan control measures. With implementation of the identified mitigation measures, construction and operation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to 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.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to expose sensitive receptors to carbon monoxide hotspots and toxic air contaminants (TAC) during construction and operation.

Facts in Support of Findings: Air quality impacts associated with the generation of carbon monoxide hotspots and toxic air contaminants were discussed on pages 3.3-25 through 3.3-27 of the Draft EIR. The nearest sensitive receptor to the project site is approximately 70 feet north of Avenue L with additional residences located to the north, northeast, east, and southeast of the project site.

Construction and operation of the proposed project would generate carbon monoxide from construction equipment and vehicles. The roadway segments within the vicinity of the proposed project would operate at LOS A and the project would contribute 1.68 percent of the surrounding readings volume to capacity ratio which is below the 2 percent threshold. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate traffic conditions resulting

in a CO hotspot. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Diesel exhaust particulate matter has been identified by the State as a TAC. Although construction and operation of the proposed project would involve the use of diesel fueled vehicles, the construction phases would occur over a limited duration. Construction phase risks would be considered acute health risks as opposed to cancer risks, which are long-term. OEHHA has yet to define acute risk factors for diesel particulates that would allow the calculation of a hazards risk index; thus, evaluation of this impact would be speculative and no further discussion is necessary.

The project is not anticipated to be a source of TACs during operation. The AVAQMD does not have an identified screening tool to determine if project impacts exceed the threshold of 10 in one million probability of contracting cancer for the Maximally Exposed Individual (MEI), so the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District was utilized. Based on this screening tool, the cancer risks from diesel particulate associated with the proposed project for the closest residential receptors is 0.00000047 per million (see Table 3.3-7). This is substantially below the thresholds of 10 in one million. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of diesel particulate matter and TACs. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to generate greenhouse gas emissions during construction and operation.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.3-20 through 3.3-22, 3.3-27 and 3.3-28 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would result in greenhouse gas emissions during construction and operation from the use of conventional construction equipment and vehicles. These construction and operational emissions would be substantially lower than the thresholds established by the AVAMQD as shown in Tables 3.3-5 and 3.3-6 of the Draft EIR. During construction, it is estimated that the proposed project would generate 11,670.65 pounds per day (lbs/day) of greenhouse gas emissions as compared to the threshold of 548,000 lbs/day. During operation, it is estimated that the proposed project would generate 134.55 lbs/day compared to the thresholds of 548,000 lbs/day. The proposed project would generate approximately 150 MWs of electricity from a renewable source (solar), offsetting greenhouse gas emissions by reducing the amount of electricity generated from fossil fuels. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to conflict with a plan, policy or regulation adopted to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.3-28 and 3.3-29 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would help the State meet the Renewable Portfolio Standard of 33 percent and its goals under Assembly Bill (AB) 32 by generating approximately 150 MWs of renewable energy. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would generate cumulative air quality impacts.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the cumulative air quality impacts associated with the proposed project.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.3-29 and 3.3-30 of the Draft EIR, development of the proposed project would result in less than significant air quality and GHG emissions. Development of the proposed project in conjunction with the projects identified in Table 3-3 would result in an increase in construction dust and exhaust emissions from construction equipment and vehicles. This increase could violate or contribute to an existing violation of air quality standards, which would be an air quality impact during construction. All cumulative projects listed in Table 3-3 would require environmental permitting and would likely incorporate mitigation measures to reduce the short-term air emissions. With implementation of AQ-1 through AQ-4, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.

Development of the proposed project in conjunction with the projects identified in Table 3-3 would not result in a cumulative effect to conflicts with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation. Most of the projects presented in Table 3-3 would facilitate the GHG emissions reductions that California expects to achieve by generating electricity from renewable energy resources rather than fossil fuel technologies. This displacement of GHGs would be consistent with the Global Warming Solutions Act, AB 32, GHG reduction goals and the Climate Change Scoping Plan. Individual projects listed in Table 3-3 would cause no other potential conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The projects listed in Table 3-3 and the projected growth would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation intended to address climate change because they would be required to comply with California's existing regulations. Therefore, because the proposed project would have a less than significant GHG impact, the proposed project would also generate a less than significant cumulative impact for GHGs.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The thresholds of significance for biological resource impacts are listed in Section 3.4 on pages 3.4-27 and 3.4-28 of the FEIR.

Potential Impact: The proposed project could 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.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to impact sensitive plant and animal species during construction and operation.

Facts in Support of Findings: Impacts to special status wildlife species were discussed in detail on pages 3.4-28 through 3.4-35 of the Draft EIR and pages 3-4 through 3-8 of the Final EIR. Three special status wildlife species were observed on the project site or gen-tie routes during surveys for the proposed project: burrowing owl, American badger, and loggerhead shrike. The project site also includes suitable habitat for coast horned lizard, ferruginous hawk, Swainson's hawk, mountain plover, and desert kit fox. Impacts to these species and migratory birds would be considered a significant impact. Mitigation measures BIO-1 through BIO-5 would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Specifically, measures BIO-1 through BIO-3 would worker awareness training and pre-construction surveys for avian species. BIO-4 and BIO-5 would reduce impacts to desert kit fox, Coast horned lizard and American badger to less than significant levels.

Impacts to special status plant species were discussed on pages 3.4-28 through 3.4-35 of the Draft EIR and pages 3-4 through 3-8 of the FEIR. The proposed project could impact special-status plant species as the project site contains potentially suitable habitat for the following species: Peirson's morning-glory, slender mariposa-lily, round-leaved filaree, pale yellow layia, Parry's spineflower, white pygmy-poppy, California androsace, Mojave spineflower and Mojave paintbrush. The surveys conducted in in 2007 through 2009 did not identify any special-status plant species. The 2014 surveys also did not identify any sensitive plant species on the project site. Impacts to sensitive plant species would be potentially significant. Mitigation measure BIO-7 requires the applicant to conduct springtime preconstruction surveys to determine the presence of special status plant species. As discussed in the Final EIR, follow up special status plant surveys conducted in March, April, and June 2015 identified 0.34 acres of Peirson's morning-glory on the project site. As such, mitigation measure BIO-7 was modified to require the payment of \$2,405 per acre to offset the loss of these special status species. These funds will be used specifically to acquire conservation habitat that contains this species. Mitigation measures BIO -1 and BIO-4 would also reduce impacts to sensitive plant species. With implementation of the identified mitigation measures, impacts to special status plant species would be less than significant.

As discussed on pages 3.4-32 and 3.4-33 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project has the potential to attract migratory waterfowl and shorebirds that could mistake the grouped panels for a body of water resulting in mortality from the collision with panels, fences, and transmission lines. As described in Section 2, Project Description, the proposed project will underground most of the gen-tie routes, but there will be some constructed overhead on poles between 45 and 50 feet in height. The applicant would, to the maximum extent feasible, construct all transmission towers, poles, and lines in accordance with the guidelines in Reducing Avian Collisions with Power Lines: State of the Art in 2012, which provides guidance for reducing bird injury and mortality from collisions with electrical lines. Impacts to avian would be less than significant; however,

mitigation measure BIO-6 would require the implementation of a Bird and Bat Conservation Strategy; thereby ensuring impacts to avian species would be less than significant.

As discussed on pages 3.4-33 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project has the potential to attract bats that could mistake the grouped panels for a body of water which could result in mortality from a collision with the panels. No bats were identified within the project site and there have been limited historic sightings within the area (within 10 miles in 1938). The project site contains marginal suitable foraging habitat for bats; as such the proposed project would have a less than significant impact to bats. To ensure impacts to bats are less than significant, Mitigation Measure BIO-6 would require the implementation of a Bird and Bat Conservation Strategy.

Potential Impact: The proposed project could potentially have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to impact riparian habitat.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.4-36 and 3.4-37 of the Draft EIR, the project site has 14 drainage features (8.35 acres) that were distinguishable by physical characteristics (defined bed, bank, channel) and/or provide some ecological functions/values to resident and migrating biological resources. The proposed project would setback development a minimum of 7 feet from the edge of potential drainages to the edge of any improvements, where feasible, to minimize impacts to drainages within the project site and along Gen-tie Route 4 and will be subject to compliance with the General Stormwater Construction Permit and a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan in order to minimize potential water quality impacts to surface water features. Some mapped drainages within the project site may need to be modified for internal circulation. If proposed project improvements are necessary within 7 feet of any of the 14 drainage features mapped within the project site, then the proposed project would be required to obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement permit from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. These requirements are identified in Mitigation Measures BIO-8, BIO-9, and BIO-10. With implementation of these measures, impacts would be less than significant.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not 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.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to impact federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and further finds that no significant impact will result from the project and no mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.4-37 of the Draft EIR, a jurisdictional delineation of the project site was performed in June/July 2014. None of the drainage features identified on the project site are designated as Waters of the United States and are therefore, no subject to federal regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. This is due to Rosamond, Buckhorn and Rogers Dry Lakes being the terminus for all drainage features within the Antelope Valley Watershed and that the Antelope Valley Watershed is a closed basin. The dry lakes are not navigable waterways and do not have use for surface water recreation or other purposes by foreign or interstate commerce, nor do they have surface water usage by industries. Therefore, no impacts to federally protected wetlands would occur as a result of the proposed project and no mitigation measures are required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project could potentially 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 wildlife nursery sites.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential substantially interfere with the movement of native fish/wildlife species, or uses of established wildlife corridors and nursery sites.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.4-38 and 3.4-39 of the Draft EIR, the project site is unlikely to contribute functionally to substantial wildlife movement locally or to be considered a regional linkage area that would be anticipated to facilitate the dispersal of plants and animals in significant numbers. Since the project site does not include notable concentrations of regionally unique or sensitive habitats, the areas surrounding the project site would not be considered essential for long-term plant and wildlife viability within the region.

Though the project site would not limit the movement of wildlife species between the project site and any established SEA's. The San Andreas SEA and Angeles National Forest contain extensive areas for movement of wildlife in large numbers and the project site would not interrupt or impact such movement. The project site does not contain any wildlife nursery sites and there are no such nursery sites adjacent or within the project area; therefore, the proposed project would not impede the use of such sites. Additionally, proposed project includes habitat friendly fencing around the project site what would be raised at regular intervals to allow small mammals to move freely in and out of the project site. Therefore, potential project impacts to wildlife corridors and nursery sites are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Project lighting could disorient the navigational abilities of other nocturnal wildlife species. The project design, as describe in Section 2 would minimize the effects of lighting on wildlife. Additionally, Mitigation Measures BIO-11 and BIO-12 would be implemented to ensure that project lighting would have a less than significant impact on wildlife.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to conflict with local ordinances protecting biological resources and further finds that no significant impact will result from the project and no mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.4-39 and 3.4-40 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would not conflict with local policies and ordinances, including goals and policies within the Plan for the Natural Environment, designed to ensure protection of biological resources. No impacts would occur and no mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: Development of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact to biological resources.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to cumulative impacts to biological resources.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.4-40 and 3.4-41 of the Draft EIR and pages 3-7 and 3-8 of the Final EIR, implementation of the proposed project could result in potentially adverse impacts to special-status species including burrowing owl, loggerhead shrike, ferruginous hawk, coast horned lizard, Swainson's hawk, mountain plover, and desert kit fox. Additionally, construction activities may result in disturbance to nesting migratory songbirds and raptors protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code, which may nest on properties adjacent to the project site. No special-status plant species with the exception of Peirson's morning glory were observed within the project site.

The related projects listed in Table 3-3 may potentially result in impacts to biological resources depending on site conditions and would be required to mitigate for impacts. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce all potential biological resource impacts to a less than significant level. The related projects located within the project vicinity and region would require mitigation, minimization, and avoidance measures to reduce impacts to natural plant and wildlife communities. These measures would reduce the cumulative effect to natural plant and wildlife communities. Additionally, the City has adopted a biological impact fee to offset the cumulative loss of biological resources within the City of Lancaster. The ordinance requires the payment of \$770 per acre to be utilized towards conservation activities and applies to all development projects regardless of the level of impact. Therefore, the proposed project, in conjunction with other projects, would not have cumulatively significant impacts to special-status species.

The related projects identified in Table 3-3 would not result in cumulative effects to jurisdictional waters and wetlands. The related projects located within the project vicinity would require mitigation, minimization, and avoidance measures to reduce impacts to jurisdictional waters and wetlands if present on the respective sites. Common mitigation

measures requiring avoidance or minimization would reduce cumulative impacts related to jurisdictional waters and wetlands.

Other projects in the vicinity of the project site, listed in Table 3-3 may result in significant impacts related to migratory wildlife corridors. These projects would be required to mitigate for impacts. Therefore, the proposed project, in conjunction with other projects within the project vicinity and region, would not have cumulatively significant impacts to migratory wildlife corridors as assessed in this section.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

The thresholds of significance for cultural resources are listed in Section 3.5 on page 3.5-21.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.5-22 of the Draft EIR, the 28 cultural resources identified within the project area are recommended not eligible for the California Register. A detailed discussion of these resources and their eligibility can be found on pages 3.5-13 through 3.5-21 of the Draft EIR. The proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource and impacts to historical resources would be less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project could potentially cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.5-22 and 3.5-23 of the Draft EIR, a field survey of the project site was conducted and archaeologists recorded five historic period resources and three isolated prehistoric finds. A detailed discussion of these resources and their eligibility can be found on pages 3.5-13 through 3.5-21 of the Draft EIR. The potential exists for encountering previously unrecorded archaeological (subsurface) resources during proposed project construction. Any previously unrecorded archaeological resource encountered would be potentially eligible for listing. In the event unknown archaeological resources are encountered, impacts would be potentially significant. With implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1 impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Potential Impact: The proposed project could potentially directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.5-23 and 3.5-24 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project has the potential to impact paleontological resources during deeper excavations into older deposits. These impacts would be significant. With implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-2 and CR-3 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Potential Impact: The proposed project could potentially disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.5-24 and 3.5-25 of the Draft EIR, there are no known human remains located in or near the project site. However, the possibility always exists that unmarked burials may be unearthed during project construction. This impact is considered potentially significant, but would be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing Mitigation Measure CR-4.

Potential Impact: Development of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact to cultural resources.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to cumulative impacts to cultural resources.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.5-25 of the Draft EIR, development of the proposed project in conjunction with the related projects in Table 3-3 has the potential to increase the risk to cultural resources in the area. Simultaneous construction of other projects in the vicinity could potentially result in significant impacts cultural resources. Compliance with the identified mitigation measures would result in a less than significant impact on cultural resources and avoidance of adverse cumulative effects.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The thresholds of significance for geology and soils impacts are listed in Section 3.6 on pages 3.6-18 and 3.6-19 of the FEIR.

Potential Impact: The project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving: i) rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault; ii) strong seismic ground shaking; iii) seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or iv) landslides.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to impacts associated with seismic hazards.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.6-19 and 3.6-20 of the Draft EIR, the project site is not located in a Alquist-Priolo zone. While the San Andreas Fault is located about 1.5 miles from the project site; the project site itself is not subject to surface rupture hazard. Based on the 2007 geotechnical study conducted at the project site, the geologic age of the earth materials, average relative density of the subsurface material, groundwater conditions, and anticipated ground-shaking hazard for the project site, the potential for liquefaction, dynamic compaction, or seismically induced settlement or bearing loss is considered low. Due to the absence of permanently elevated groundwater table, the relatively low seismicity and the relatively shallow depth to rock, the potential for seismically induced slope instability is considered negligible even though there is a high ground-shaking hazard. This impact is considered less than significant.

The ground-shaking hazard in the project area is high and a large earthquake on a nearby fault could cause substantial ground shaking at the project site. As part of the design process described above, the applicant is required to implement IEEE, IBC, and CBSC standards into the project design for applicable features to minimize the potential ground-shaking hazards on associated project features. Therefore, ground-shaking impacts would be less than significant.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to cause substantial soil erosion.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.6-21 and 3.6-22 of the Draft EIR, construction and operation of the proposed project could result in soil erosion impacts. While minimal grading would occur on the project site, construction activities would loosen the soil surfaces making them susceptible to erosion. The proposed project would minimize on site grading, the installation of proposed facilities, including roads, fencing, and solar arrays, could result in erosion and soil loss if not properly mitigated. Mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-4 and HYD-1 would ensure that impacts from erosion would be less than significant.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not 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.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 regarding the proposed project's potential to result in landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.6-22 and 3.6-23 of the Draft EIR, severe ground shaking can cause loose, saturated, subsurface materials to liquefy. The CGS Seismic Hazards Zone Map for the Del Sur Quadrangle indicates there are

potential liquefaction zones associated with the historic washes at three areas along the southwestern boundary of the project site. The project design calls for a minimum setback of 7 feet from the edge of existing drainages to the edge of access roads where feasible. Additionally, due to the absence of permanently elevated groundwater table and the density of the soils, the potential for seismically induced slope instability is considered less than significant with mitigation. With implementation of GEO-1, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Potential Impact: The project would not be located on expansive soil, as define in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to be located on expansive soils.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.6-23 of the Draft EIR, soils on the project site have a low shrink-swell potential and do not include expansive soils. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: Development of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact with respect to geology and soils.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to cumulative impacts to geology and soils.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.6-24 of the Draft EIR, development of the proposed project in conjunction with the related projects identified in Table 3-3 would result in further development of various land uses in the City of Lancaster. These impacts tend to be site specific; however, construction in a seismically active region puts people and structures at risk from a range of earthquake-related effects. Various mechanisms are in place to reduce seismic-related risks from construction. The proposed project would not exceed acceptable risk of upset and would not contribute to a seismic hazard elsewhere. The proposed project would have minor cumulative effects with respect to soil erosion and mitigation measures were identified to reduce project soil erosion to less than significant levels. The related projects are required to comply with similar measures. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The thresholds of significance for hazards and hazardous materials impacts are listed in Section 3.7 on page 3.7-16 of the FEIR.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to impacts associated with the routine transport, use and disposal of hazardous materials.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.7-17 of the Draft EIR, construction and operation of the proposed project would utilize small quantities of commonly used materials, such as fuels, oils, and lubricants to operate construction equipment and paint and cleaning solvents for maintenance activities. The use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes are controlled by existing regulations that will be followed during construction and operation of the proposed project. Additionally, standard construction BMPs would be implemented to reduce pollutant discharge during construction. This impact would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving a hazardous materials release into the environment.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to impacts associated with reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions into a hazardous materials release.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.7-17 through 3.7-21 of the Draft EIR, during construction of the proposed project individuals could be inadvertently exposed to hazardous substances. Use of these materials is governed by existing regulations and standard BMPs as part of the project's SWPPP and NPDES permit requirements (Mitigation Measure HYD-1). These measures would minimize any potential exposure to hazardous materials and impacts would be less than significant.

Construction activities would generate fugitive dust and could expose workers and sensitive receptors Valley Fever. This would be a potentially significant impact. The proposed project would minimize the generation of fugitive dust through AVAQMD's regulations and implementing standard construction BMPs which are identified in mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-4. These measures would minimize the likelihood or extent of fugitive dust, thereby reducing the potential for exposure to Valley Fever. In addition to the air quality measures, Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 would further minimize potential health hazards during construction. This measure includes additional dust suppression during periods of extended high heat or excessive wind to minimize the release of fugitive dust and fungal spores. Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 requires the implementation of worker training and personnel protective equipment to minimize the risk of exposure for construction personnel. Therefore, potential health hazards during construction would be less than significant.

Potential for exposure to hazardous materials during operation includes the potential exposure to microcrystalline silicon or cadmium telluride (CdTe). Photovoltaic modules may contain small amounts of regulated materials, which vary from one technology to another (e.g., the metals Cd, Pb, Se, Cu, Ni and Ag). Microcrystalline silicon PV panels may include small amounts of solid materials that are considered hazardous. Because such materials are in a solid and non-leachable state, broken microcrystalline PV panels

would not be a source of pollution to surface water, stormwater, or groundwater. In PV modules using “thin-film” CdTe technology, the cadmium is in the environmentally stable form of a compound rather than the leachable form of a metal. The CdTe compound is encapsulated in the PV module, with the PV module containing very little cadmium, less than 0.1% by weight. The results of studies show that exposure point concentrations in soil, air, and groundwater are one to six orders of magnitude below human health screening levels, indicating that impacts related to exposure to solar panel materials would be less than significant.

Potential health effects from exposure to electric fields from power lines is typically not of concern since electric fields are effectively shielded by materials such as trees and walls. As part of the siting and construction process, all proposed gen-tie lines would be sited with nothing underneath them that would conflict with grounding and some gen-ties would be underground. Therefore, this is considered a less than significant impact and no mitigation measures are required.

Corona or gap discharges related to high frequency radio and television interference impacts are dependent upon several factors including the strength of broadcast signals and are anticipated to be very localized if it occurs at all. After energizing the gen-tie line the applicant will respond to and document all radio/television/equipment interference complaints received and the responsive action taken. The electric fields associated with the proposed project’s transmission lines may be of sufficient magnitude to impact operation of a few older model pacemakers (pre-1990) resulting in them reverting to an asynchronous pacing. The result of the interference is of short duration and is considered less than significant. These impacts are considered less than significant impact and no mitigation measures are required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, it would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to impacts associated with hazardous materials sites and further finds that no significant impact will result from the project and no mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.7-21 and 3.7-22 of the Draft EIR, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, including a regulatory database search, was conducted for the project site. There is no known source of subsurface contamination on the project site and no known sources of off-site contamination with the potential to migrate to the project site through groundwater. Therefore, there would be no impact from hazardous waste sites and no mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to impacts to an adopted emergency response/emergency evacuation plan.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.7-22 of the Draft EIR, construction of the proposed project would generate a total of 12,168 truck deliveries or 20 trips per day over the course of construction. Additionally, up to 250 worker trips could occur during the peak construction period over the anticipated 24 months of construction. The impact of this increased traffic could be potentially significant because 90th Street West; from Avenue L north to the County line, Avenue L; from 90th Street West eastward, and Avenue K; from 90th Street West eastward, are identified evacuation routes in the City. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-1 would ensure traffic flows smoothly, reducing impacts on emergency vehicle access or evacuation to a less than significant level.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would 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.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to expose people or structures to wildland fires.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.7-22 and 3.7-24 of the Draft EIR, the project site consists primarily of desert lands in an area considered to be at low risk for wildland fires because they are surrounded by fire breaks. In conformance with the City of Lancaster and Los Angeles County Fire Department standards for solar facilities, the project site would include perimeter roads, evenly distributed interior access roads, and water storage tanks. Project construction and maintenance would involve the use of heavy equipment, welding, and other activities which have the potential to ignite fires. As such, proposed project construction and maintenance activities and the malfunction of electrical equipment could increase the potential for wildland fires, causing a potentially significant impact. While not common, there is the potential for events causing potential fire onsite. This impact is considered potentially significant. With implementation of mitigation measure HAZ-3 this impact would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not generate cumulatively considerable impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to cumulative hazardous materials/hazard impacts associated with the proposed project.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.7-24 through 3.7-26 of the Draft EIR, construction and operation of the proposed project in conjunction with the related projects identified in Table 3-3 of the Draft EIR has the potential to generate cumulative impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials.

Hazardous materials used during construction are of low toxicity and would consist of fuels, oils, and lubricants. The proposed project would involve the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as fuels, lubricating oils, hydraulic fluids, glycol-based coolants, lead-acid batteries, solvents, paints, and coatings. Solar facilities could also involve the use of the toxic elemental metal cadmium, and other chemicals depending on the solar technology used. While the related projects have the potential to cause similar impacts, these projects are also required to implement BMPs and following the existing regulations with respect to hazardous materials. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact with respect to the use, transport and disposal of hazardous materials.

Construction and operational activities of the proposed project and related projects, including renewable energy projects, would involve the disturbance of soil. This could cause the Valley Fever spores to be spread through the air. The proposed project is required to implement additional mitigation measure to reduce the potential exposure to Valley Fever. The related projects are also required to control dust and are likely to have additional measures with respect to Valley Fever. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to a cumulative Valley Fever impact would not be considerable and impacts are less than significant.

Development of renewable energy projects would require use of slow-moving heavy-duty trucks and could obstruct traffic in a manner that could inhibit emergency response temporarily during construction phases. Implementing traffic controls and measures to avoid or repair wear and tear from construction traffic would avoid this impact. The proposed project would not contribute to a cumulative impact on increased hazards and the risk for a traffic incident or inhibit emergency response.

The construction of the proposed project in conjunction with the related projects would increase the interface of wildlands and development. Renewable energy facilities could increase the potential for wildland fire hazards through the use of hazardous materials, and the introduction of people, equipment, and vehicles into rural areas. Mitigation HAZ-3 would require a Fire Protection Plan to reduce the impact. Consequently, the risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires as a result of project construction, in conjunction with other related projects, would not be cumulatively considerable.

H. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The thresholds of significance for hydrology and water quality are listed in Section 3.8 on pages 3.8-9 and 3.8-10 of the FEIR.

Potential Impact: The proposed project could potentially violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to water quality impacts associated with the proposed project.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.8-10 through 3.8-12 of the Draft EIR, construction activities would create the potential for soil erosion and possibly

increase sedimentation, both onsite and downstream of the project site. Construction activities could increase the potential for accidental release of pollutants which would degrade water quality by increasing constituent levels in surface waters and could lead to an exceedance of water quality standards. As a result of temporary construction activities, short-term, construction related water quality degradation would be considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-1 would reduce the temporary, short-term construction-related drainage and water quality impacts to a less than significant level.

Long-term operation of the proposed project would not adversely affect water quality or lead to violation of water quality standards. Once operational, onsite activities would be limited to operation, inspection, and maintenance of the solar arrays and their supporting infrastructure, including panel washing. Any excess wash water would run off the panels and infiltrate into the ground, and not cause sedimentation or other water quality concerns. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-1, impacts would be less than significant.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not 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 use or planned uses for which permits have been granted.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to groundwater impacts associated with the proposed project.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.8-12 through 3.8-14 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project is anticipated to utilize approximately 322 acre-feet (104,900,000 gallons) during construction for soil conditioning, dust control, single panel wash, and other uses. After construction, the proposed project would require approximately 3.069 acre-feet (1 million gallons) of water annually to clean the panels. An additional 2.0 acre-feet of water would be required for irrigation use, and 3.9 acre-feet would be used for dust control, if needed. Water for irrigation would only be needed until the landscaping is established (approximately 2 years). Water for construction and operation of the proposed project would be obtained through agreements with private landowners to use existing wells or supplied by the City of Lancaster Recycled Water Program and trucked to the project site. Given seasonal temperatures, much of this runoff would evaporate or infiltrate into the ground as it runs off the solar panels.

Construction of the proposed project would create some impervious surfaces (approximately 3% of the project site) within the project site due to access roads and concrete pads. However, a majority of the project site would remain in a pervious condition and allow water to infiltrate into the ground. Given that the amount of new impervious cover created by the proposed project would be minimal, it would not substantially interfere with groundwater recharge. Water identified for the proposed project is currently being used and sourced from within the project area and watershed, either by way of agricultural uses or through the City's recycled water program. As such,

the proposed project will not 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; resulting in a less than significant impact. No mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the alteration of the existing drainage pattern associated with project construction and operation resulting in substantial erosion or siltation.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.8-14 and 3.8-15 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project is not anticipated to substantially affect runoff since the proposed project includes minimal changes in existing natural landforms, ongoing vegetation maintenance efforts during construction and operation, and limited areas of compaction. These measures would establish a consistent hydrologic response that is similar to the natural condition. A small amount of flow concentration would be expected to occur where the runoff falls from each panel (the “drip line”), but this runoff is expected to disperse beneath the adjacent down slope modules. Therefore, the proposed project is expected to increase runoff.

The relatively flat topography found on the project site would require minimal grading. Therefore, the current onsite topography would not substantially change as a result of the proposed project. The minimal amounts of grading on the project site would create minor modifications to existing drainage paths. Most of the roads and panel arrays would be setback approximately 7 feet from the edge of the existing drainages. However, some of the interior roadways would require crossings over some of the drainages and these crossings would be designed to allow for the flow patterns of the channels to remain undisturbed. The minimal amount of new impervious cover created by the proposed project would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns and increase erosion or siltation onsite or offsite. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not 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.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the alteration of the existing drainage pattern associated with project construction and operation resulting in flooding.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.8-15 and 3.8-16 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project is not expected to significantly alter the existing natural drainage patterns. The proposed project would not alter runoff volumes or alter existing

drainage patterns in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to impacts associated with stormwater drainage systems or additional sources of polluted runoff.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.8-16 of the Draft EIR, the runoff from the project site drains into intermittent drainages that eventually infiltrate into the ground and are not tributary to other receiving water bodies or stormwater treatment facilities. No new stormwater facilities are planned for construction. The volume of water available as surface water runoff is not expected to differ from existing conditions.

The operation of the proposed project would require approximately 9.0 acre-feet of water which would decrease after two years, when the proposed native landscape is established. Approximately 3.00 acre-feet per year used would be for washing the panels two times per year. Any runoff would infiltrate into the ground as it runs off the solar panels and would not create additional surface water runoff that would exceed drainage systems. No new or expanded drainage facilities are anticipated to be required as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, impacts associated with stormwater drainage capacity are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to substantially degrade water quality.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.8-17 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would not create any potential water quality impacts not previously discussed. The project construction and operations would not affect any public or known private water supplies. Nearly all water used on site would either evaporate at the surface or infiltrate into the ground. There are no downstream surface water bodies that would receive runoff from the site under normal operating conditions or average storm events. Incidental contaminants in stormwater running off project infrastructure (e.g. metals, oils) would be filtered via infiltration before reaching subsurface aquifers. Therefore, the impact to water quality is anticipated to be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to place structures with a 100-year flood hazard area and further finds that no significant impact will result from the project and no mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.8-17 of the Draft EIR, the project site is designated as Zone X which is outside both the 100-year and 500-year floodplain. No FEMA designated Special Flood Hazard Areas or mapped regulatory floodways exist on the project site. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not 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.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to impacts associated with the failure of a levee or dam and further finds that no significant impact will result from the project and no mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.8-18 of the Draft EIR, the project site is not located within the inundation area of any levees or dams. Therefore, there would be no impact. In the event of catastrophic failure to the Aqueduct above the project site, there is a possibility to have severe effects on project infrastructure and personnel on-site; however, no such incident is expected as the Aqueduct is highly monitored and maintained by the California Department of Water Resources and no such previous incidents have been recorded. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not be subject to inundation by seiches, tsunami, or mudflow.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to impacts from seiches, tsunamis, or mudflow.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.8-18 and 3.8-19 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project is not likely to be subject to seiches or mudflow. The only body of water in the vicinity of the proposed project is the California Aqueduct. Based on the relatively small cross section of the California Aqueduct, seiche-related hazards in the vicinity of the aqueduct are considered to be small. Additionally, there is minimal potential for local slope instability from mudflows at the project site. Other geologic and seismic hazards are unlikely to affect the project site. The project site is underlain by bedrock which is not susceptible to subsidence. There are no active volcanoes in close proximity to the project site. The project area is not adjacent to an ocean coastline or bay and therefore would not be subject to tsunamis. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact to hydrology and water quality.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.8-18 of the Draft EIR, hydrologic and water quality impacts tend to be localized; therefore, the areas near the project site would be most affected by project activities. Development of the proposed project and related projects identified in Table 3-3 would require project-specific SWPPPs that would include site-specific measures to reduce the potential cumulative surface water quality impacts of these construction projects. These SWPPPs would reduce site-specific water quality impacts to close to zero such that cumulatively adverse hydrology and water quality impacts would not occur. This would be a less than significant cumulative impact.

I. LAND USE, POPULATION, AND HOUSING

The thresholds of significance for land use, population, and housing are listed in Section 3.9 on pages 3.9-5 and 3.9-6 of the FEIR.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not physically divide an established community.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to divide an established community and further finds that no significant impact will result from the project and no mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.9-6 of the Draft EIR, there is no established community within or adjacent to the project site. Existing residences directly north of the project site are not located in close proximity to one another and are not considered a community in a physical sense. The existing homes in the vicinity of the project site are located to the north, east, and west of the project and utilize existing roadways for access. Construction and operation of the project site would not physically divide these homes. No impacts would occur and no mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not 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.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's consistency with the City of Lancaster's General Plan 2030 and the Southern California Association of Government's 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) goals and policies.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.9-7 through 3.9-22 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would be consistent with both the City's General Plan and SCAG's RTP/SCS with the approval of the requested General Plan Amendment and Zone Change (see Tables 3.9-2 and 3.9-3 of the Draft EIR). Mitigation measures have been identified in specific resource areas (aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, noise, and traffic/transportation) which would reduce all impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, impacts with respect to land use would be less than significant and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not 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).

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.9-22 and 3.9-23 of the Draft EIR, would require construction workers, many of which have specialized skills. Most of these workers would come from the surrounding area, but some may choose to temporarily relocate to the Antelope Valley. Sufficient temporary exists for construction workers and the proposed project would not require the construction of new homes or businesses. Temporary construction impacts would not induce substantially population growth in the City of Lancaster or the surrounding communities, either directly or indirectly; therefore, impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable land use impact.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to land use impacts.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.9-22 and 3.9-23 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project in conjunction with the related projects identified in Table 3-3 could impact existing land uses during construction either on or adjacent to a project site by increased noise levels, dust, and emissions from construction equipment; degradation of scenic resources due to the presence of construction activities or equipment; and exposure to hazards or hazardous materials. Long-term operational effects of renewable facilities and the associated transmission lines include the conversion of existing land uses on a project site to new uses or the preclusion of planned land uses. The proposed project and related projects are required to be consistent with the General Plan and zoning code requirements. In addition, the proposed project would require a general plan amendment, zone change and conditional use permit. With approval of these applications, the proposed project would be consistent with applicable provisions and ordinances of both the City's General Plan and zoning ordinance. The proposed project would not physically divide a community or conflict with any policies adopted for the purposes of avoiding environmental impacts. Therefore, it would not contribute to any cumulative land use impacts.

Construction and operation of utility-scale renewable energy and transmission projects permitted by the City of Lancaster will bring workers to the community. However, sufficient housing exists to accommodate these workers. While these activities would result in cumulative population increase to the area, projects permitted by the City would not increase population beyond the expected growth anticipated under the City's General Plan. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable land use impact.

J. NOISE

The thresholds of significance for noise impacts are listed in Section 3.10 on page 3.10-16.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would result in 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.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's noise impacts during construction and operation.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.10-17 through 3.10-21 of the Draft EIR, construction activities associated with the proposed project are anticipated to last approximately 24 months. These activities include minor vegetation grubbing; minor grading; soil compaction for inverter pads, switchyard, and roads; and installation of solar energy system infrastructure. The impact analysis assumed that the three loudest pieces of construction (grader, dozer, and compactor) would be operating at the same time and in the same location near the residences on Avenue L. This was a worst case scenario and would result in noise levels of 85.4 dBA-Lmax and 80.6 dBA-Leq at 70 feet. Driving of the solar panel support posts could occur within 100 feet of the nearest residence and was analyzed as a separate component of construction due to the temporary nature of the activities. As indicated in Table 3.10-12 pile driving could produce a sound level of 94.8 dBA Lmax and 87.8 dBA Leq at a distance of 100 feet. Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-10 would be implemented to reduce construction noise in the proximity of sensitive receptors. This could include the use of temporary barriers to reduce noise levels.

Construction-related traffic would pass close to sensitive receptors along Avenue K and Avenue L. As summarized in Table 3.10-13 this traffic would generate maximum noise levels of approximately 66.9 dBA at 70 feet. These noise levels would slightly exceed noise standards at the nearest residence. While the construction traffic would exceed the residential noise standard, the ambient noise levels at Receptors 4 and 7 already exceed this level. The proposed project would temporarily increase noise levels by 0.9 dBA. As discussed in the Draft EIR, an increase in noise levels of less than 1 dBA is generally not audible to the human ear. The noise-reducing construction practices specified in Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-10 would reduce truck noise and noise from other construction equipment to levels that are below the exterior noise standard. Additionally, Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would restrict noise along Avenue K and Avenue L by restricting construction operations between 8 p.m. and 7 a.m. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-10 would reduce noise impacts during construction of the proposed project to less than significant levels.

During operation of the solar facility, sources of potential noise include trackers, inverters/transformers and noise generated by electricity discharge from the transmission lines. Based on noise measurements collected at an adjacent solar facility, noise levels within 50 feet of an operating solar facility are approximately 63.14 dBA Lmax and

62.12 dBA Leq, which is below the 65 dBA standard. This noise level is well below the City daytime noise standards and likely would not be audible above the ambient sound level. Operations would include panel washing twice a year. Based on the analysis in the Draft EIR, the noise level at the nearest residence from where washing could occur would be approximately 65 dBA which is within the City daytime noise standard and likely would not be audible above the ambient sound level. In addition, washing would be a short term and infrequent maintenance activity. Therefore, noise impacts during operation of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's impacts from groundborne vibration or noise levels.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.10-22 of the Draft EIR, the solar panels would be supported by metal piers that would be driven into the ground by a vibratory pile driving machine. The results in Table 3.10-14 indicate that vibration from pile driving at the nearest residence would be 0.0918 PPV. This vibration is below the strongly perceptible annoyance criteria (0.1 PPV) and potential residential vibration damage (0.3 PPV) criteria thresholds listed in Table 3.10-4. The proposed project would not result in exposure of people to excessive ground vibration. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to permanently increase ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project site.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.10-23 of the Draft EIR, construction noise associated with the proposed project would be temporary and would not result in a permanent increase in ambient noise. Operation of the proposed project would generate noise from the potential trackers, inverters/transformers, and transmission lines. None of these sources are expected to result in noise increases that would exceed City noise standards. Thus, a substantial permanent increase in existing ambient noise is not expected. This impact would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project could potentially result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels associated with the proposed project.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.10-23 of the Draft EIR, the construction of the proposed project would occur during the daytime when the noise standard is less stringent. Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-10 would require implementation of noise-reducing construction practices. As discussed above, noise from construction equipment, including on-road trucks and commute vehicles, would not exceed City's noise standards with implementation of the identified mitigation measures.

Potential Impact: The proposed project could result in a cumulative noise impact.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to cumulative noise impacts.

Facts in Support of Findings: The project level noise analysis found on pages 3.10-17 through 3.10-24 indicates that potential for the proposed project to result in noise that exceeds City Noise Ordinance standards would have a less than significant cumulative construction noise impact. Implementation of mitigation measures NOI-1 through NOI-10 would ensure compliance with applicable City noise standards which would avoid the potential for the proposed project to contribute to significant cumulative construction noise impacts. The related projects listed in Table 3-3 would undergo an environmental review that would include consideration of local standards. Each project would be required to comply with the local standards and provide mitigation for impacts.

Likewise operational impacts would result in low intensity noise generated by the project's stationary equipment, including potential trackers and inverters, and would not likely be audible in any location outside the immediate project site. Noise from this equipment would be highly localized to the project site and would not combine with other cumulative development to result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels, including at the adjacent noise sensitive rural residential homes. The proposed project would generate minimal trips during operation, and maintenance vehicles would periodically circulate throughout the site. The noise generated by worker trips on area roadways combined with other cumulative development would not be cumulatively considerable.

K. PUBLIC SERVICES, UTILITIES, SERVICE SYSTEMS, AND RECREATION

The thresholds of significance for public services, utilities, service systems, and recreation impacts are listed in Section 3.11 on pages 3.11-7 and 3.11-8.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a 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.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential impacts on public services during construction and operation.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.11-8 through 3.11-10 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would not cause significant impacts to public services

during construction and operation. Potential impacts associated with fire protection services and police protection services would be less than significant and no new or physically altered facilities would be required to meet demand. Since no permanent increase in population would occur as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed project, impacts to schools, parks, and governmental facilities such as libraries would be less than significant.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not result in the exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to exceed wastewater treatment requirements and further finds that no significant impact will result from the project and no mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.11-11 of the Draft EIR, no wastewater facilities exist on the project site and no such facilities would be constructed as part of the proposed project. Portable restroom facilities would be provided and maintained for construction crew use during construction and maintenance of the proposed project. The proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements. No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not construct new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, with the potential to cause significance environmental effects.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to impacts associated with the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities and further finds that no significant impact will result from the project and no mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.11-11 and 3.11-12 of the Draft EIR, no water or wastewater treatment facilities are located on the project site and none would be constructed as part of the proposed project. No new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities would be needed for operation of the proposed project. The applicant has sufficient water for the development of the proposed project from existing sources, including recycled water. The City has confirmed that there is adequate recycled water supplies to serve the proposed project and the applicant has negotiated agreements for water supply for the construction and operation of all sPower projects from wells and water rights owned by the existing land owners. These water rights are approximately 20 acre-feet per year. As such, the proposed project would not create any need for new or expanded facilities to treat water or wastewater. There is no impact and no mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not construct new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, with the potential to cause significant environmental effects.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to construction of new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.11-12 of the Draft EIR, stormwater runoff from the proposed project is expected to be minimal and would be captured onsite in accordance with the site's existing stormwater systems that are sufficient to capture increased stormwater from the proposed project. Impacts are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not create a need for new or expanded entitlements or resources for sufficient water supply.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to new or expanded entitlements for water supply.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.11-12 and 3.11-13 of the Draft EIR, the primary use of water during construction would be for dust control. The estimated worst-case scenario construction-related water demand is 322 acre feet, although actual demand may vary depending on the season during which construction work occurs and the amount of water required for erosion control purposes. Water, including for construction, would be obtained through agreements with private landowners to use existing wells or from recycled water available through the City of Lancaster.

Water demand for project operations would require approximately 3.0 acre-feet for panel washing. Water for irrigation of the landscaping would not be needed after it is established (anticipated to be two years). The applicant has negotiated agreements for water supply for the construction and operation of all the applicant's related projects from wells and water rights owned by the existing landowners. These water rights are approximately 20 acre feet per year. No new or expanded entitlements would be needed for operation. Therefore, construction and operational impacts associated with groundwater supplies would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not exceed capacity of existing wastewater treatment facilities.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's potential to exceed the capacity of the existing wastewater treatment facilities and further finds that no significant impact will result from the project and no mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.11-14 of the Draft EIR, no wastewater treatment facilities exist on the project site and none would be constructed as part of the proposed project. Wastewater generated by the proposed project would be handled by portable restrooms which are required to have adequate capacity for the project's construction and maintenance personnel. No wastewater facilities would be required and no impact would occur.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not exceed the relevant landfill's permitted capacity.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to impacts on the permitted capacity of the landfill.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.11-14 and 3.11-15 of the Draft EIR, construction waste generated by the proposed project is expected to be minimal and consist of mostly recyclable materials such as cardboard, steel, and electrical wiring. The minimal amount of solid waste expected to be generated during construction and operation of the proposed project is not expected to contribute significantly to the landfill's permitted capacity. Operation of the proposed project would result in minimal waste generation related to repairs and maintenance. As such, the proposed project would not result in any substantial solid waste disposal needs for construction or operation. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would be consistent with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the proposed project's consistency with applicable solid waste regulations and further finds that no significant impact will result from the project and no mitigation is required.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.11-15 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would comply with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations related to the disposal of solid waste. There would be no impact and no mitigation would be required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not 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.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to the increase in use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.11-15 and 3.11-16 of the Draft EIR, no increase in population would occur with implementation of the proposed project. During construction, the peak workforce is anticipated to be approximately 250 workers, and construction activities could temporarily increase the use of existing parks and recreational facilities in the City of Lancaster or Los Angeles County. The proposed project is not expected to require more than six technicians during operation for routine maintenance and emergency repairs. The six workers would not permanently or significantly contribute to the use of existing parks and other recreational facilities in the region. Thus, there would be no increase in the demand for neighborhood or regional parks, or other recreational facilities that would accelerate the physical deterioration of an existing facility.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to impacts associated with the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.11-16 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would construct bike lanes and equestrian trails in conformance with the City of Lancaster Master Plan of Trails and Bikeways. The proposed project would be consistent with the City's Master Plan. As such, the proposed project would not result in a significant environmental impact from the expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.

Potential Impact: cumulative impacts

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to cumulative impacts to public services and utilities.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.11-17 and 3.11-18 of the Draft EIR, the impacts to public services and utilities from the proposed project would be less than significant. When combined with the development of the related projects identified in Table 3-3, the proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable impact.

L. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

The thresholds of significance for transportation and traffic impacts are listed in Section 3.12 on pages 3.12-7 and 3.12-8 of the FEIR.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to impacts on various modes of transportation.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.12-8 through 3.12-10 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would generate traffic through the transport of workers, equipment, and materials to and from the project site. Such transport activities would be temporary and required only during the proposed project's construction; however, increases in traffic levels, although temporary, could potentially result in adverse effects to the local circulation system. Approximately 12,168 truck trips are anticipated during the 24-month construction period (20 trips per day). As shown in Table 3.12-1, both Avenue L and Avenue K are operating at LOS A. Table 3.12-2 provides the proposed project's maximum contribution to existing traffic volumes and assumes that all 270 (20

trucks/250 workers) trips travel on both Avenue K and Avenue L. As shown in Table 3.12-2, the proposed project would increase traffic 1.68 percent during the most intensive phase of the project. Thus, the project-related trip volume increases would not constitute an exceedance of the LOS standards for roadways. Mitigation Measure TRA-1 would require a traffic management plan, describing construction staging and traffic control measures to maintain levels of service and minimize impacts to traffic. Therefore, short term construction impacts to the existing circulation system capacity would be less than significant with incorporation of the identified mitigation measure.

Once operational, the proposed project would generate only a nominal amount of traffic for periodic maintenance and panel cleaning activities. These activities would be distributed throughout the year and would generate a maximum of 12 one way trips. Therefore, operational traffic would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-1.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not 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.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect congestion management plan impacts.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.12-10 and 3.12-11 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact from short term construction traffic. Given the limited construction time, coupled with the fact that Construction Management Plans are intended to improve regional circulation over the longterm; construction traffic from the proposed project would be less than significant. Furthermore, in accordance with the 2010 CMP, Antelope Valley Freeway (Highway 14) and Highway 138 currently operate at a LOS D or better in both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours within and surrounding the City of Lancaster and Palmdale areas.

Scheduled maintenance and emergency repairs would generate up to 12 employee trips per day, including water truck deliveries, the increase in vehicle trips, resulting from project operations, are not expected to substantially degrade the traffic operation of surrounding roadway network to unacceptable levels of service. In summary, the proposed project would not conflict with a congestion management program and impacts would be less than significant.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not 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.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to air traffic pattern impacts.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.12-12 of the Draft EIR, the closest airport to the project site is located approximately 4 miles to the northeast. The proposed project would not involve any structures that would require registration with the

Federal Aviation Administration and solar photovoltaic projects pose little to no impact on military operations, testing, and training related to aircraft navigation. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact to air traffic patterns and no mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to impacts associated with hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.12-12 and 3.12-13 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would not require any new circulation improvements other than previously approved roadway alignments and project related driveway approaches to the project site access points. Roadway visibility and access in the area is acceptable. Construction trucks and equipment could temporarily slow traffic flow. However, the impact would be less than significant and further reduced through implementation of the Mitigation Measure TRA-1.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to emergency access to the project site.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on page 3.12-13 of the Draft EIR, the portions of Avenue L and 90th Street West in the vicinity of the project site are designated as evacuation routes. The project would not create significant traffic volumes during construction or operations. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact to emergency access and no mitigation is required.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to impacts to alternative transportation.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.12-13 and 3.12-14 of the Draft EIR, the project is located in a rural area where alternative transportation is not commonly used. Because the proposed project is not adjacent to a roadway with alternative modes of transport (bike and pedestrian travel) the proposed project would not increase hazards or create barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists, nor would it interfere with bus routes or turnouts. In conformance with the City of Lancaster's Master Plan of Trails and Bikeways, bike lanes and equestrian trails would be constructed. Accordingly, the proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation and no impacts would occur. The proposed project would not generate

demand for public transit, nor does it include transit facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with policies or standards related to alternative transportation modes; the impact would be less than significant.

Potential Impact: The proposed project would result in a less than significant cumulative traffic impact.

Finding: The City hereby makes Finding 1 with respect to cumulative traffic impacts.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed on pages 3.12-14 and 3.12-15 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would increase traffic along Avenue L and K by 1.68% during the most intensive phase of the project. Given that each of these roadways presently operates well within minimum LOS standards, the temporary increase in daily trips would not increase traffic levels on these highways and roadways to the extent that minimum LOS standards are exceeded. Therefore, short-term construction and decommissioning impacts associated with the existing circulation system capacity would be less than significant.

The related projects listed in Table 3-3 would also result in temporary construction level impacts. The staggered construction schedules of the related projects and the nominal amount of average daily traffic that would be generated during the operations phase of most of these facilities would only minimal impact the overall effectiveness of the local and regional circulation system and less than significant cumulative impacts would occur. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable impact on transportation.

6. **FINDINGS ON PROJECT ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THE DRAFT EIR**

The CEQA Guidelines indicate that an EIR must “[d]escribe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” (CEQA Guidelines §15126.6[a].) Accordingly, the alternatives selected for review in the DEIR and FEIR focus on alternatives that could eliminate or reduce significant environmental impacts to a level of insignificance, consistent with the project’s objectives (i.e., the alternatives could impede to some degree the attainment of project objectives, but still would enable the project to obtain its basic objectives). Three alternatives to the proposed project were considered in the FEIR, as follows:

- Alternative 1 – No Project/No Development
- Alternative 2 – No Project/Existing Land Use and Zoning
- Alternative 3 – Reduced Size and Increased Setback

Each of these alternatives was considered in terms of their ability to reduce significant impacts of the proposed project, their feasibility and ability to achieve the project’s objectives. The project’s objectives are as follows:

- Support the efforts of the City of Lancaster and the State of California to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions consistent with the timeline established by California Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.
- Support the energy goals stated in the City of Lancaster General Plan 2030, as well as other policies in the plan, designed to protect the City of Lancaster's environment and economy.
- Minimize impacts to threatened or endangered species or their habitats, wetlands, and waters of the United States and the State of California, cultural resources, and sensitive land uses.
- Provide an investment in California and the City of Lancaster that would create jobs and other economic benefits.
- Develop an economically feasible and commercially financeable project.
- Maximize the use of existing transmission infrastructure while minimizing the network upgrade costs borne by the California ratepayer.
- Ensure that the proposed project can be technologically constructed in a manner that allows electricity to be provided at a competitive price.
- Develop a facility that is situated in a California Renewable Energy Zone close to existing electrical infrastructure or transmission lines.

A. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND SUBSEQUENTLY DISMISSED

An EIR must briefly describe the rationale for selection and rejection of alternatives. The Lead Agency may make an initial determination as to which alternatives are potentially feasible and, therefore, merit in-depth consideration, and which are clearly infeasible. Alternatives that are remote or speculative, or the effects of which cannot be reasonably predicted, need not be considered (*CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6(f)(3)). This section identifies alternatives considered by the Lead Agency, but rejected as infeasible, and provides a brief explanation of the reasons for their exclusion. As noted above, alternatives may be eliminated from detailed consideration in the EIR if they fail to meet most of the project objectives, are infeasible, or do not avoid any significant environmental effects (*CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6(c)). In the Draft EIR, five alternatives were considered but rejected as infeasible: Alternative Location, Phased Development, Wind Power, Avenue L Access Restrictions, and Distributed Generation.

Alternative Location

Alternative locations to the project site were considered as an alternative for the proposed project. Such sites would need to be large enough to accommodate the size of the proposed project; consist of undeveloped or underdeveloped properties; be within close proximity to a regional electrical substation or transmission line and within the Fairmont Competitive Renewable Energy Zone (CREZ). Alternative sites in the Fairmont CREZ would meet the project objective of close proximity to existing substations or transmission lines and minimal cost of connection to existing electrical infrastructure; however, there were no suitable lands at

the same size and scale as the proposed project. However, the applicant currently has site “control” over a number of parcels in western Lancaster, with applications under review by the City.

Given the patchwork of undeveloped lands on the southwestern side of the City of Lancaster, there are limited lands that meet the proposed project evaluation criteria that also fall within the Fairmont CREZ. This alternative was eliminated from further consideration because:

- It would not substantially reduce the significant environmental impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality and biological resources.
- The site would not offer a substantial reduction in impacts relative to the project. Both it and the proposed project would utilize low value lands.
- It would fail to meet the applicant’s objectives for the proposed project related to providing GHG reduction and economic benefits to City of Lancaster.

Phased Development Alternative

Under this alternative, the proposed project would be constructed over a longer period of time than currently proposed. This would reduce the number of daily vehicle trips necessary, thereby reducing traffic impacts on roadways in the project area.

The project owner has financial obligations to bring the majority of the facility online by the end of 2016 in order to qualify for the 30% Federal Investment Tax Credit (ITC) that is set to expire on that date. The proposed project economics are predicated on leveraging the ITC to finance and construct the proposed project. Without the ability construct the project on a 24 month build schedule, the proposed project would not be able to capture the 30% ITC on the majority of the proposed project and would be unable to generate sufficient returns to finance and construct.

The Lancaster Energy Center Project is being constructed to contribute to California’s Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) of 33% by 2020. The mandate is being phased to meet the ultimate target and one of the key milestones is 25% of retail sales by December 31, 2016. If the proposed project is not fully online by this date, the off-taking utility will not be able to receive RPS credit from the project until it comes online, and the proposed project may be liable for damages that undermine the proposed project’s economics.

Wind Power Alternative

Wind power is an alternative energy source that would help meet California’s RPS. Typical wind farm installations consist of three-bladed turbines that range in height from 300 to 500 feet, with blades up to 150 feet in length. As with a solar energy facility, individual turbines would be interconnected with a medium-voltage power collection system and a communications network. A substation would increase the medium voltage electrical current through a transformer before connection to the high-voltage transmission system.

Wind power is only feasible in those areas of the State with substantial, sustained winds. One of the most important climatic factors is the direction and intensity of the prevailing winds.

Prevailing winds in the project area are out of the west and southwest. The project site has an annual wind speed of 7-8 meters per second at a height of 80 meters according to mapping by the National Renewable Energy Lab. Therefore, the project site is feasible from a naturally occurring wind perspective. However, while wind is a renewable energy source and the project site may be suitable for wind farms, the City's Municipal Code does not allow for utility scale wind farms to be constructed within the City limits.

Avenue L Access Restrictions Alternative

This alternative assumes the proposed project would be designed with no site access along Avenue L. Having no access along Avenue L would prove to be infeasible, as the site design must accommodate multiple access points throughout the proposed project to provide adequate emergency response. As currently designed, the proposed project limits access driveways along Avenue L directly across from the existing rural residential homes; however, restricting access along the entire stretch of Avenue L would create a greater level of impact on emergency services than the proposed project. Given that the proposed project has been revised based on feedback reviewed from a variety of sources, this alternative would have a higher level of impact on emergency response times, public services, and wildfire hazards than the proposed project; therefore, in other words, it would not substantially reduce any of the proposed project's impacts, making it infeasible.

Distributed Power Alternative

This alternative assumes the 150 MW production capacity of the proposed project would be provided by solar panels placed on the roofs of residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional buildings throughout the City of Lancaster. The Distributed Power Alternative would not convert the project site's existing land use, impact the surrounding roadway network during construction, or impact species and habitats.

The Distributed Power Alternative is less efficient than the proposed project in terms of the amount of surface area that would be required to support a sufficient number of solar panels to produce 150 MW. Rooftop solar installed on industrial and commercial buildings can typically utilize about 60% to 65% of the roof area due to limitations of structural adequacy and shading. Assuming that 15% of the proposed project site is utilized for roads and other infrastructure related to the facility, rooftop solar alone would require substantially more space than the approximately 1,191 acres of area of the proposed project site that would be disturbed during construction. Parking lots at commercial and industrial building sites may also support solar panels, which would expand the opportunities for solar arrays at these locations. Matching the proposed project's production capacity would require more than 9,993 sites in order to generate the 150 MW proposed by the applicant. As of the end of January 2015, the City had 39,941 MW of distributed generation throughout the city on 2,661 sites (2,576 single family residences, 16 multifamily residential complexes, 35 commercial uses, 4 college and high schools, 5 City sites, and 25 elementary schools).

The electricity produced at each distributed location is used by the building occupants. The remaining electricity, if any, is supplied to the electric utility. In many cases, the size of rooftops on which solar panels would be placed may not be sufficiently expansive to generate

more electricity than would be consumed by the users of the building on which the panels are placed. Where that is the case, the solar panel installation would reduce a portion of the building's demand on the electrical grid, but would not directly contribute energy to the grid.

Unlike the proposed project, proximity to an electrical substation or transmission line and specific site conditions are not critical concerns for this alternative because power generation is distributed across many locations with limited capacity at each site and panels would be placed on existing roofs. The balance of power produced that is not used locally would be fed into the grid such that demand for capacity within any one decentralized, local and/or regional transmission facility would be minimal. Neither a substation nor switchyard facility would be needed. Small inverters would be used at each site to convert power from direct to alternating current.

It is assumed that the solar panel rooftop installations would be constructed and owned/operated by private entities or owners of the buildings on which the installations are placed. Because of this the energy production would be limited to the owners and operators of the system on which the buildings are placed, because the energy production would take place "behind the meter," which would limit the availability of other users to benefit from the alternative energy. This in combination with the limited amount of available structures would make this alternative practically infeasible. This alternative could proceed on a site-by-site basis without any additional action by the City. Consequently, significant impediments to commercial viability, including transaction costs, legal access, and contractual obligations, prevent the Distributed Power Alternative from becoming a reality. Additional impediments to this alternative's viability include the fact that the applicant does not control or have legal access to the hundreds to thousands of rooftops that would be required to construct 150 MW of solar generation by way of the Distributed Power Alternative. It is anticipated that the Distributed Power Alternative would result in greater levels of impact related to construction level of noise and traffic, as well as additional services demands on public services and potable water use. Therefore, this alternative would have a higher level of impact while having similar levels of all other impacts and would not substantially reduce any of the proposed project's impacts.

B. ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT / NO DEVELOPMENT

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(1) requires that the no project alternative be described and analyzed "to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the project with the impacts of not approving the project." The no project analysis is required to discuss "the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published . . . as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services" (Section 15126.6(e)(2)).

The No Project/No Development Alternative assumes no development would occur on the project site. The project site would remain in an undeveloped open space state. Grazing could occur on the project site under this alternative, as allowed by the City of Lancaster General Plan and zoning for the site. The potential environmental impacts associated with the No Project/No Development Alternative are described on pages 6-8 through 6-11 of the Draft EIR and also

compares the environmental impacts associated with the No Project/No Development Alternative to those anticipated with the proposed project.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would result in fewer impacts to all resource categories and would avoid most impacts associated with the proposed project's short-term and long-term impacts. However, this alternative would result in greater long-term impacts from greenhouse gas emissions as no alternative energy and would not provide emission reductions for the State from non-fossil fuel based energy production. While this alternative would result in fewer environmental impacts than the proposed project, it would not meet the majority of the project objectives. The only objective that the No Project/No Development Alternative would meet is to minimize impacts to threatened or endangered species or their habitats, wetlands and waters of the United States and the State of California, cultural resources, and sensitive land uses.

In conclusion, while the No Project/No Development Alternative would have less environmental impacts than the proposed project, this alternative would fail to meet most of the project's objectives.

Finding: The No Project/No Development Alternative would have less environmental impacts than the proposed project; however, it would only achieve one of the project's nine objectives. The City therefore finds that Alternative 1 is not preferable to the proposed project.

C. ALTERNATIVE 2: NO PROJECT / EXISTING LAND USE AND ZONING

Under Alternative 2, the project site could be developed to the maximum intensity allowed under the existing land use designations of the City of Lancaster General Plan. The project site is currently designated as a mix of NU (Non-Urban Residential), UR (Urban Residential), and C (Commercial) and zoned SP (Specific Plan) and RR-2.5 (rural residential, minimum lot size, 2.5 acres). Under this alternative, the project site could be developed with approximately 1,450 single family residences and 240,000 square feet of commercial uses. No utility scale solar would be constructed. The potential environmental impacts associated with the No Project/Existing Land Use and Zoning Alternative are described on pages 6-11 through 6-15 of the Draft EIR and also compares the environmental impacts associated with the No Project/Existing Land Use and Zoning Alternative to those anticipated by the proposed project.

The No Project/Existing Land Use and Zoning Alternative would result in a significantly greater level of impact to most of the resource categories when compared to the proposed project. However, this alternative would result in fewer impacts related to Agriculture and Land Use and an equivalent level of impacts related to cultural resources. Additionally, this alternative would only meet 1 of 9 project objectives; to provide an investment in California and the City of Lancaster that would create jobs and other economic benefits.

Finding: The No Project/Existing Land Use and Zoning Alternative would result in significantly greater impacts to most resource areas including aesthetics, air quality/greenhouse gases, biological resources, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, noise public services/utilities and traffic. It would also reduce impacts to agricultural resources and land use. However, none of impacts identified for the proposed project were significant and

unavoidable. Additionally, the No Project/Existing Land Use and Zoning Alternative would only meet one of the nine project objectives. The City finds that the No Project/Existing Land Use and Zoning Alternative is not preferable to the proposed project as it does not meet the project objectives and results in greater environmental impacts.

D. ALTERNATIVE 3: REDUCED SIZE AND INCREASED SETBACK

The Reduced Size and Increased Setback Alternative would reduce the project site to those areas located southwest of the 500 kV transmission line corridor and the setback along Avenue L would be increased by approximately 100 feet from the southern edge of Avenue L. All other aspects of the alternative (i.e., construction, operations, and maintenance) would be the same as the proposed project. The project site under the Reduced Size and Increased Setback Alternative would be approximately 986.34 acres and would disturb approximately 993.42 acres through installation of solar arrays and gen-tie lines. The Reduced Size and Increased Setback Alternative would also reduce the energy generation capacity of the project. The potential environmental impacts associated with this alternative were discussed on pages 6-15 through 6-21 of the Draft EIR and also compares the environmental impacts associated with the Reduced Size and Increased Setback Alternative to those anticipated with the proposed project.

The Reduced Size and Increased Setback Alternative would result in a similar level of impact when compared to the proposed project related to all resource categories with the exception of Greenhouse Gases, which would be greater due to the alternative offsetting less fossil fuel generated electricity. Additionally, this alternative would meet six of the nine project objectives. The three objectives which this alternative would not meet include: Develop an economically feasible and commercially financeable project; maximize the use of existing transmission infrastructure while minimizing the network upgrade costs borne by the California ratepayer; and ensure that the proposed project can be technologically constructed in a manner that allows electricity to be provided at a competitive price.

Additionally, the size of this project is based on the economics of constructing the transmission interconnection facilities needed to interconnect the project to the previously approved collector substation or LADWP transmission line and the competitive landscape of the renewable energy market in California. By spreading the transmission costs across a 150-MW solar project, the costs per unit can support the economics of interconnecting the project.

By reducing the size of the project by 8%, the interconnection per unit cost becomes prohibitively high making the project uncompetitive and ultimately uneconomical. The project owner has financial obligations to bring the majority of the facility online by the end of 2016 in order to qualify for the 30% Federal Investment Tax Credit (ITC). The proposed project economics are predicated on leveraging the ITC to finance and construct the proposed project. Resizing the project by 8% may trigger a long series of interconnection re-evaluations that jeopardize the project's ability to come online before expiration of the ITC making the project uneconomical. The development, permitting, and land costs have been predicated on a 150-MW project. If the generation capacity were to be reduced by 8%, the project development and deployments costs would not support the economics of developing a smaller project. Given the location of the project, it is unlikely that the network upgrades costs assigned to the project

would be reduced in the event of a downsizing. Thus, the smaller project would need to support large network upgrade costs, making it uneconomical.

Finding: While the Reduced Size and Increased Setback Alternative would create a similar level of environmental impacts across most of the resource areas, it would create a greater impact with respect to greenhouse gas emissions. The reduction of the proposed project by approximately 8 percent in size would increase the interconnection costs, including network upgrades, and may trigger an interconnection reevaluation. These costs and delays are likely to make the smaller project economically unviable and not likely to proceed.

7. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The City of Lancaster Planning Commission hereby declares that, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the Planning Commission has balanced the benefits of the proposed project against any significant and unavoidable environmental impacts in determining whether to approve the proposed project. If the benefits of the proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts, those impacts are considered "acceptable."

The Planning Commission hereby declares that the EIR has identified and discussed significant effects that may occur as a result of the project. With the implementation of the mitigation measures discussed in the DEIR and FEIR, these impacts can be mitigated to a level of less than significant level. The Planning Commission did not identify any impacts as significant and unavoidable.

The Planning Commission hereby declares that it has made a reasonable and good faith effort to eliminate or substantially mitigate the potential impacts resulting from the project,

The Planning Commission hereby declares that to the extent any mitigation measures recommended to the City are not to be incorporated, such mitigation measures are infeasible because they would impose restrictions on the project that would prohibit the realization of specific economic; social, and other benefits that this Planning Commission finds outweigh the unmitigated impacts.

The Planning Commission further finds that except for the project, all other alternatives set forth in the FEIR are infeasible because they would prohibit the realization of the project objectives and/or specific economic, social or other benefits that this Planning Commission finds outweigh any environmental benefits of the alternatives.

The Planning Commission hereby declares that, having reduced the adverse significant environmental effects of the project, to the extent feasible by adopting the proposed mitigation measures, having considered the entire administrative record on the project and having weighed the benefits of the project against its environmental impacts after mitigation, the Planning Commission has determined that the social, economic and environmental benefits of the project outweigh the potential environmental impacts and render those potential significant impacts acceptable based upon the following considerations:

- A. The project will generate 150 MW of alternative energy helping to meet the State's Renewable Portfolio Standard of 33% percent by 2020 and help the City of Lancaster achieve net-zero status.
- B. The project will help offset greenhouse gas emissions from the production of electricity from fossil fuel in compliance with AB 32.
- C. The project will augment the City's economic base by yielding one-time revenues to the City of Lancaster from sales tax on construction materials.
- D. The project will provide approximately 250 total construction jobs over a 24-month period and 1 full-time permanent job that are vitally important, given the City's unemployment situation.

As the CEQA Lead Agency for the proposed action, the City of Lancaster has reviewed the project description and the alternatives presented in the EIR and fully understands the project and project alternatives proposed for development. Further, this Planning Commission finds that all potential adverse environmental impacts and all feasible mitigation measures to reduce the impacts from the project have been identified in the Draft EIR, the Final EIR and public testimony. This Planning Commission also finds that a reasonable range of alternatives was considered in the EIR and this document, and finds that approval of the project is appropriate.

This Planning Commission has identified economic and social benefits and important policy objectives, which result from implementing the project. The Planning Commission has balanced these substantial social and economic benefits against the effects of the project. Given the substantial social and economic benefits that will accrue from the project, this Planning Commission finds that the benefits identified herein override the environmental effects.

California Public Resource Code 21002 provides: "In the event specific economic, social and other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects can be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof." Section 21 002.1(c) provides: "In the event that economic, social, or other conditions make it infeasible to mitigate one or more significant effects of a project on the environment, the project may nonetheless be approved or carried out at the discretion of a public agency ..." Finally, California Administrative Code, Title 4, 15093 (a) states: "If the benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered 'acceptable.'"

The Planning Commission hereby declares that the foregoing benefits provided to the public through approval and implementation of the project outweigh the identified significant adverse environmental impacts of the project that cannot be mitigated. The Planning Commission finds that each of the project benefits outweighs the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts identified in the DEIR and, therefore, finds those impacts to be acceptable.

Mit. / Cond. No.	Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval	Monitoring Milestone (Frequency)	Method of Verification	Party Responsible for Monitoring	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
AESTHETICS							
AES-1.	Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the applicant shall submit a landscaping plan to the City for review and approval. Perimeter landscaping shall be provided around the portions of the project site that are visible from the roadways as shown on the final approved site plan. The landscaping plan shall be prepared by a landscape architect and shall utilize drought tolerant and preferably native plant species. All landscaping shall be installed prior to the project becoming operational.	Prior to the final approval of a grading plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities. Prior to signing off on the certificate of occupancy for the solar facility.	Approval of landscaping plans. Installed landscaping shall be inspected prior to signing off on the certificate of occupancy for the solar facility.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning)			
AES-2	Due to the presence of single family residences on the north side of Avenue L, the perimeter landscaping on Avenue L between 80 th Street West and 90 th Street West shall be enhanced. The enhanced landscaping shall incorporate larger size plants at the time of planting and a wider variety of plant species to provide an aesthetically pleasing appearance and to screen the project site from view more quickly. This enhanced landscaping shall be noted on the landscaping plan identified in Mitigation Measure AES-1.	Prior to the final approval of a grading plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities. Prior to signing off on the certificate of occupancy for the solar facility.	Approval of landscaping plans. Installed landscaping shall be inspected prior to signing off on the certificate of occupancy for the solar facility.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning)			
AES-3	The applicant shall paint all of the water tanks on the project site so that they are not shiny and reflective. The paint color shall be approved by the City of Lancaster prior to the issuance of construction permits.	Prior to the final approval of a grading plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	Approval of the paint color sample.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning)			

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							
AIR-1.	The applicant shall submit a copy of the AVAQMD approved Dust Control Plan to the City of Lancaster prior issuance of any construction related permits.	Prior to the final approval of a grading plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	A copy of the AVAQMD approved dust control plan.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning)			
AIR-2	<p>Fugitive dust emissions during construction and operational activities shall be controlled by regular watering or other dust preventive measures using the following procedures as specified by the AVAQMD, including but not limited to AVAQMD Rule 401, Visible Emissions and Rule 403, Fugitive Dust:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-site vehicle speed shall be limited to 15 miles per hour. • All on-site construction roads with vehicle traffic shall be watered periodically. • Streets adjacent to the project site shall be swept as needed to remove silt that may have accumulated from construction activities so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust. • All material excavated or graded shall be sufficiently watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust. Watering shall occur at least twice daily with complete coverage, preferably in the late morning and after work is done for the day. • All clearing, grading, earth-moving, or excavation activities shall cease during periods of high winds (i.e., greater than 25 	Compliance with the identified mitigation measure shall be verified by building inspectors and air district during the construction period.	Field inspections.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Building and Safety) and the AVAQMD.			

Mit. / Cond. No.	Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval	Monitoring Milestone (Frequency)	Method of Verification	Party Responsible for Monitoring	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	<p>miles per hour averaged over one hour) so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All material transported on-site or off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust. The area disturbed by clearing, grading, earth-moving, or excavation operations shall be minimized so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust. 						
AIR-3	<p>All trucks hauling excavated or graded material on-site shall comply with State Vehicle Code Section 23114 regarding the prevention of such material spilling onto public streets by use of shed boards, truck covers, and other protective measures.</p>	<p>Compliance with the identified mitigation measure shall be verified by building inspectors and air district during the construction period.</p>	<p>Field inspections.</p>	<p>Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Building and Safety) and the AVAQMD.</p>			
AIR-4	<p>During construction activities, excessive construction equipment and vehicle exhaust emissions shall be controlled by implementing the following procedures, as specified by the AVAQMD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Properly and routinely maintain all construction equipment, as recommended by manufacturer manuals, to control exhaust emissions; Shut down equipment when not in use for extended periods of time to reduce emissions associated with idling engines; Encourage ride sharing for construction employee commuting to the project site; and Use electric equipment for construction 	<p>Compliance with the identified mitigation measure shall be verified by building inspectors and air district during the construction period.</p>	<p>Compliance with the identified mitigation measure shall be verified by building inspectors and air district during the construction period</p>	<p>Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Building and Safety) and the AVAQMD.</p>			

Mit. / Cond. No.	Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval	Monitoring Milestone (Frequency)	Method of Verification	Party Responsible for Monitoring	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	whenever possible in lieu of fossil fuel fired equipment.						
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES							
BIO-1	Prior to construction, a qualified biologist shall conduct environmental awareness training for all construction personnel. This training shall be given to construction personnel to brief them on how to recognize special-status plant species, special-status wildlife species, and sensitive habitats. Construction personnel shall also be trained on all required mitigation measures and best management practices. This training shall be provided to each new construction contractor/personnel prior to the individual doing any work on the project site. Copies of the environmental training reference pamphlets shall remain onsite throughout construction of the proposed project. The copies of the pamphlets shall be available to any personnel upon request and shall be visibly posted in the construction trailer.	Prior to final approval of a grading/construction plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	Prior to any rolling, vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpiling, or construction activities, copies of the environmental training reference pamphlet shall be provided to the City for review and approval. Copies of the training log shall be provided to the City on a monthly basis. Field inspections shall be conducted to ensure pamphlets are posted in the construction trailer.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning)			
BIO-2	A nesting bird survey for migratory birds and raptors, including the ferruginous hawk, Swainson's hawk, loggerhead shrike, and mountain plover, shall be conducted within 30 days of the issuance of any construction related permits. In the event that an active bird nest is encountered during the survey, a non-activity buffer zone shall be established and the nest shall be monitored by a biologist to ensure site activities do not cause it to be abandoned. Fencing and/or flagging will be used to delineate the	Prior to final approval of a grading/construction plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	Prior to any rolling, vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpiling, or construction activities, a copy of the report from a biologist with the results of the migratory bird and raptor survey.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning)			

Mit. / Cond. No.	Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval	Monitoring Milestone (Frequency)	Method of Verification	Party Responsible for Monitoring	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	no-activity zone. To minimize the potential effect to the reproductive success of the nesting pair, the extent of the no-activity zone will be based on the distance of the activity to the nest, the type and extent of the proposed activity, the duration and timing of the activity, the sensitivity and habituation of the species, and the dissimilarity of the proposed activity to background activities. The no-activity zone will be large enough to avoid nest abandonment and will generally range between 50 and 500 feet from the nest, or as otherwise required by CDFW, depending upon the species.		Field inspections as needed.				
BIO-3	A qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey for burrowing owls within 30 days of initiating ground-disturbing activities. The survey area shall encompass the work area plus a 500 feet buffer surrounding the project site. If burrowing owls are present in the direct disturbance area and cannot be avoided, passive relocation techniques, such as installing one-way doors at burrow entrances, may be used. Passive relocation methods should only be used during the breeding season if a qualified biologist has determined that the nest is unoccupied. If additional owl burrows are within 500 feet of the project's construction, CDFW shall determine if the owls are or would be affected by construction and, if establishing an exclusion zone is required, determine if the burrow is occupied or not.	Prior to final approval of a grading/construction plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	Prior to any rolling, vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpiling, or construction activities, a copy of the report from a biologist with the results of the burrowing owl survey. Field inspections as needed.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning)			
BIO-4	No rodenticides, pesticides, or herbicides shall be utilized on the project site.	Prior to final approval of a grading/construction plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	Prior to any rolling, vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpiling, or construction activities, a letter shall be submitted by the	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning)			

Mit. / Cond. No.	Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval	Monitoring Milestone (Frequency)	Method of Verification	Party Responsible for Monitoring	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
			applicant stating that none of these products shall be used.				
BIO-5	<p>A qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey for desert kit fox, coast horned lizard, and American badger within 30 days of initiating ground-disturbing activities. The biologists will conduct den searches by systematically walking transects through the project site and a buffer area. Transect distance should be based on the height of vegetation such that 100 percent visual coverage of the project site is achieved. If a potential or known den is found during the survey, the biologists will measure the size of the den, evaluate the shape of the den entrances, and note tracks, scat, prey remains, and recent excavations at the den site. The biologists will also determine the status of the dens and map the features. Written results of the surveys including the locations of any potential or known desert kit fox dens will be submitted to CDFW within 5 days following completion of the survey and prior to the start of ground disturbance or construction activities.</p> <p>After preconstruction den searches and before the commencement of construction activities, exclusion zones will be established outward from the entrance or cluster of entrances of any occupied den. Construction activities will be prohibited or greatly restricted within these exclusion zones. Only essential vehicular operation on existing roads and foot traffic will be permitted. All other construction activities, vehicle operation, material and equipment storage, and other ground-disturbing activities will be prohibited in the exclusion zone. Barrier fencing will be removed within 72 hours of completion of work.</p>	Prior to final approval of a grading/construction plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	<p>Prior to any rolling, vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpiling, or construction activities, a copy of the report from a biologist with the results of the desert kit fox, coast horned lizard, and American badger survey.</p> <p>Field inspections as needed.</p>	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning)			

Mit. / Cond. No.	Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval	Monitoring Milestone (Frequency)	Method of Verification	Party Responsible for Monitoring	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
BIO-6	In order to minimize potential construction, operations, and maintenance related impacts to bird and bat species, the applicant shall develop a Bird and Bat Conservation Strategy (BCCS) prior to the onset of project activities. As part of the development of the BCCS, a Nesting Bird Monitoring Plan will be developed to manage bird nesting within the project during operations, which will avoid and minimize any effects to actively nesting avian species. Adaptive management measures will also be included as part of the BCCS in order to effectively manage the results of implemented Monitoring Plan to minimize impacts to bird and bat species.	Prior to final approval of a grading/construction plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	Prior to any rolling, vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpiling, or construction activities, the applicant shall submit a BCCS to the City for review and approval.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning)			
BIO-7	<p>To avoid or minimize potential impacts to endangered, threatened, rare, and/or special-status plants within the project footprint, pre-construction surveys will be conducted specifically for those species that bloom between March and June by a qualified biologist. Given that the botanical surveys conducted within the project site and along the gen-tie lines in 2014 were conducted during June, July, and November 2014, potential special-status plants that bloom between March and June could occur. Of the species identified with having potential suitable habitat within the project site, Pierson's morning-glory, slender mariposa-lily, round-leaved filaree, pale-yellow layia, Parry's spineflower, white pygmy-poppy, California androsace, Mojave spineflower and Mojave paintbrush will be the target species for pre-construction surveys.</p> <p>Approximately 0.34 acres of Pierson's morning-glory were identified within the southern portion of the project site. The applicant shall pay \$2,405 per acre to offset the loss of sensitive plan species. These funds will be held by the City and used to acquire</p>	Prior to final approval of a grading/construction plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	Prior to any rolling, vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpiling, or construction activities, the applicant shall pay a total of \$817.70 for Pierson's morning glory habitat.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning)			

Mit. / Cond. No.	Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval	Monitoring Milestone (Frequency)	Method of Verification	Party Responsible for Monitoring	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	conservation property with the same plant species.						
BIO-8	Prior to the modification (e.g., dredge, fill, etc.) of any of the identified drainage features within the project site or along Gen-tie Route 4, the applicant shall obtain a streambed alteration permit under Section 1600 et seq. of the CFG Code.	Prior to final approval of a grading/construction plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	The applicant shall clearly delineate on the construction plans submitted for approval, which drainages would be modified. Additionally, the applicant shall submit a copy of the Streambed Alteration Agreement or letter from CDFW stating one is not needed for each of the drainages to be modified.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning)			
BIO-9	A 7 foot setback shall be provided from the edge of on-site drainages to the edge of any construction activities (internal roadways or solar arrays) to the extent possible. This setback shall be clearly marked with orange construction fencing or flagging during construction activities. This measure does not apply to drainages that need crossings to accommodate internal circulation.	Prior to final approval of a grading/construction plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	The applicant shall clearly identify on the construction plans submitted for approval the 7-foot setback for each of the drainages that will not be modified.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning)			
BIO-10	Sediment and erosion control materials shall be installed prior to construction and shall be maintained for the duration of construction activities to avoid and minimize effects on existing drainages.	Prior to final approval of a grading/construction plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	The construction plans submitted to the City for approval shall clearly identify the sediment and erosion control measures to be utilized. Field inspections as needed.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning and 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
BIO-11	No lighting shall be placed near or oriented towards any transmission lines running through the project site to avoid affecting wildlife that may use this area for nighttime movement.	Prior to final approval of a grading/construction plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	All types and locations of project lighting shall be clearly marked on the construction plans submitted to the City for approval.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning)			
BIO-12	Narrow spectrum bulbs shall be used to limit the range of species affected by project lighting.	Prior to final approval of a grading/construction plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	All types of project lighting shall be clearly marked on the construction plans submitted to the City for approval.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning)			
CULTURAL RESOURCES							
CR-1	If buried cultural resources such as chipped or groundstone, historic debris, or building foundations, are inadvertently discovered during ground-disturbing activities, work shall stop in that area and within a 100-foot radius of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find and, if necessary, develop a response plan, with appropriate treatment measures, in consultation with the City of Lancaster, State Historic Preservation Officer, and other appropriate agencies. Preservation in place shall be the preferred treatment method per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b) (avoidance, open space, capping, easement). Data recovery of important information about the resource, research, or other actions determined during consultation, is allowed if it is the only feasible treatment method.	During construction.	Field inspection and notification of City staff.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning)			
CR-2	The applicant shall provide training to all construction personnel to ensure that they can recognize fossil materials in the event any are discovered during	Prior to final approval of a grading/construction plan, issuance of a	Submittal of a copy of the training materials covered by the	Development Services Department, Community Development Division			

Mit. / Cond. No.	Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval	Monitoring Milestone (Frequency)	Method of Verification	Party Responsible for Monitoring	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	construction. The training shall be conducted by a paleontologist. Construction personnel shall be instructed on the importance of paleontological specimens that might be recovered.	stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	paleontologist and the training log. The training log shall be submitted to City on a monthly basis with any new construction personnel.	(Planning)			
CR-3	A qualified paleontologist shall conduct a pre-construction training of all construction personnel involved in any ground disturbing construction activity for the entire proposed project. Construction personnel shall be informed of the possibility of buried paleontological resource within the project site and the protocol to be followed if a paleontological resource is encountered.	Prior to final approval of a grading/construction plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	Submittal of a copy of the training materials covered by the paleontologist and the training log. The training log shall be submitted to City on a monthly basis with any new construction personnel.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning)			
CR-4	<p>If human skeletal remains are encountered, ground-disturbing activities shall be stopped within a 100 foot radius of the discovery. The county coroner shall be contacted immediately and is required to examine the discovery with 48 hours. If the county coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the Coroner shall contact the NAHC within 24 hours. A qualified archaeologist (QA) should also be contacted immediately. The coroner is required to notify and seek out a treatment recommendation of the NAHC designated MLD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If NAHC identified an MLD, and the MLD makes a recommendation, and the landowner accepts the recommendation, then ground-disturbing activities may resume after the QA verifies and notifies the County that the recommendations have 	During construction	Field inspection, as needed.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning)			

Mit. / Cond. No.	Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval	Monitoring Milestone (Frequency)	Method of Verification	Party Responsible for Monitoring	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	<p>been completed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If NAHC is unable to identify the MLD, or the MLD makes no recommendation, or the landowner rejects the recommendation, and mediation per PRC 5094.98(k) fails, then ground-disturbing activities may resume, but only after the QA verifies and notifies the County that the landowner has completely reentered the human remains and items associated with Native American burials with appropriate dignity on the property, and ensures no further disturbance of the site per PRC 5097.98(e) by county recording, open space designation, or a conservation easement. <p>If the coroner determines that no investigation of the cause of death is required and that the human remains are not Native American, then ground-disturbing activities may resume, after the coroner information the County of Los Angeles of such determination. According to State law, six or more human burials at one location constitute a cemetery and disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony.</p>						
GEOLOGY AND SOILS							
GEO-1	For those parts of the proposed project to be located in mapped liquefaction zones, design and construct project in compliance with applicable local permitting requirements for construction within liquefaction zones.	Prior to final approval of a grading/construction plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	The applicant shall submit a geotechnical study for those areas identify the necessary construction requirements.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (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
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS							
HAZ-1	Additional dust suppression measures shall be implemented between June 1 and November 30. The additional dust suppression measures shall be implemented prior to and immediately following ground disturbing activities if wind speeds exceed 15 mph or temperatures exceed 95 degrees Fahrenheit for three consecutive days. The additional dust suppression shall continue until winds are 10 mph or lower and ambient air temperatures are below 90 degrees for at least two consecutive days. The additional dust suppression measures shall be incorporated into the Dust Control Plan. A copy of the approved Dust Control Plan shall be submitted to the City of Lancaster prior to the issuance of construction related permits.	Prior to final approval of a grading/construction plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	Prior to any rolling, vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpiling, or construction activities, the applicant shall submit a copy of the AVAQMD approved dust control plan.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning) and AVAQMD			
HAZ-2	<p>Prior to issuance of any construction related permits, the applicant/developer shall prepare and implement a worker training program that describes the potential health hazards associated with Valley Fever, common symptoms, proper safety procedures to minimize health hazards, and notification procedures if suspected work-related symptoms are identified during construction. Copies of the training program shall be provided to the City of Lancaster.</p> <p>The worker training program shall identify safety measures to be implemented by construction contractors during construction. These measures shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HEPA-filtered, air-conditioned enclosed cabs shall be provided on heavy equipment when available. Workers shall be trained on the proper use of cabs, such as turning on air 	Prior to final approval of a grading/construction plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	<p>Prior to any rolling, vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpiling, or construction activities, copies of the valley fever training materials shall be provided to the City for review and approval. Copies of the training log shall be provided to the City on a monthly basis.</p> <p>Field inspections shall be conducted to ensure pamphlets are</p>	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning)			

Mit. / Cond. No.	Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval	Monitoring Milestone (Frequency)	Method of Verification	Party Responsible for Monitoring	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	<p>conditioning prior to using the equipment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication methods, such as two-way radios, shall be provided for use by workers in enclosed cabs. • Personal protective equipment (PPE), such as half-mask and/or full-mask respirators equipped with particulate filtration, shall be provided to workers active in dust work areas upon request. • Separate, clean eating areas with hand-washing facilities shall be provided for construction workers. • Equipment, vehicles, and other items shall be cleaned before they are moved offsite to other work locations. 		posted in the construction trailer.				
HAZ-3	<p>The applicant shall prepare a Fire Protection Plan prior to beginning construction. The Fire Protection Plan shall include the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal combustion engines, stationary and mobile, shall be equipped with spark arresters in good working order. • All personnel shall be trained in the fire safety practices relevant to their duties. • All construction and maintenance personnel shall be trained and equipped to extinguish small fires. • Work crews shall have fire-extinguishing equipment on hand, as well as emergency numbers and cell phone or other means of contacting the Fire Department. 	Prior to final approval of a grading/construction plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	Prior to any rolling, vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpiling, or construction activities, the applicant shall submit a Fire Protection Plan to the City for review and approval. A copy of the approved plan shall be provided to the Fire Department.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning)			

Mit. / Cond. No.	Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval	Monitoring Milestone (Frequency)	Method of Verification	Party Responsible for Monitoring	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Security gates shall be approved by the Fire Department and include the installation of "Knox" key switch or "Knox" padlock, whichever is most appropriate. Smocking shall be prohibited while operating equipment and shall be limited to paved or graveled areas or areas cleared of all vegetation. Smoking shall be prohibited within 30 feet of any combustible material storage area (including fuels, gases, and solvents). Smoking shall be prohibited in any location during a Red Flag Warning issued by the National Weather Service for the project area. 						
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY							
HYD-1.	Prior to the issuance of any construction related permits, the applicant shall prepare and submit an NOI to the State Water Board and prepare a SWPPP in compliance with the NPDES GCP requirements. The final drainage plan shall demonstrate the ability of the planned onsite storm drainage to adequately collect onsite stormwater flows in accordance with all applicable standards and requirements by: minimizing impervious surfaces, and directing flows to BMPs; integrating appropriate sized BMPs to minimize impact on local water quality by controlling runoff from erosion and potential contaminants; and incorporating bio-retention in combination with site planning, and dispersion of runoff to meet Low Impact Development (LID) requirements.	Prior to final approval of a grading/construction plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	Prior to any rolling, vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpiling, or construction activities, the applicant shall provide a copy of the NOI that was submitted to the State Water Board and the SWPPP.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Planning and 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
NOISE							
NOI-1	The onsite speed limit for all vehicles and construction equipment shall be limited to 15 mph.	During construction.	Field Inspection.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Building and Safety)			
NOI-2	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.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Building and Safety)			
NOI-3	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.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Building and Safety)			
NOI-4	Electrically power equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment; where feasible.	During construction.	Field Inspection.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Building and Safety)			
NOI-5	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.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Building and Safety)			
NOI-6	Fixed construction equipment, including compressors and generators, shall be located as far as practicable from noise-sensitive receptors.	During construction.	Field Inspection.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Building and Safety)			
NOI-7	The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells, shall be for safety warning	During construction.	Field Inspection.	Development Services Department, Community			

Mit. / Cond. No.	Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval	Monitoring Milestone (Frequency)	Method of Verification	Party Responsible for Monitoring	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	purposes only.			Development Division (Building and Safety)			
NOI-8	No project-related public address or music system shall be audible at any adjacent receptor.	During construction.	Field Inspection.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Building and Safety)			
NOI-9	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 factor 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.	During construction.	Field Inspection.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Building and Safety)			
NOI-10	Where necessary noise-reducing enclosures or temporary barriers shall be used around noise-generating equipment. Where feasible existing barrier features (terrain, structures) shall be used to block sound transmission especially where sensitive receptors are located less than 100 feet from construction activities and construction noise levels are expected to exceed the maximum exterior noise standard.	During construction.	Field Inspection.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Building and Safety)			
TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC							
TRA-1	A traffic management plan shall be submitted to the City of Lancaster for review and approval prior to the issuance of any construction permits. The traffic management plan shall include strategies for minimizing impacts to traffic, effectively managing traffic flow and reducing the number of trips accessing the project site during the peak hours of 7 a.m. to 9	Prior to final approval of a grading/construction plan, issuance of a stockpile or construction permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	A traffic control plan shall be submitted by the applicant for approval by the City prior to the start of construction.	Development Services Department, Community Development Division (Traffic Engineering)			

Mit. / Cond. No.	Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval	Monitoring Milestone (Frequency)	Method of Verification	Party Responsible for Monitoring	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	<p>a.m. and 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. These strategies shall include, but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require parking within designated areas on the project site and prohibit parking along the shoulders of the adjacent roadways. • Provide for emergency vehicle movement through the project site at all times during construction and operation. • Provide approved offsite parking for workers with shuttle services to transport them onsite when and if onsite parking becomes restricted or unfeasible. • Facilitate materials delivery during off-peak traffic hours and comply with regulations governing oversized loads. • Encourage vanpool and carpool for construction employees commuting to the project site. 						