1. Project title and File Number:
   General Plan Amendment No. 18-02
   Zone Change No. 18-02
   Conditional Use Permit No. 18-04

2. Lead agency name and address:
   City of Lancaster
   Development Services Department
   Community Development Division
   44933 Fern Avenue
   Lancaster, California 93534

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

4. Applicant name and address:
   San Pablo A, LLC (dba sPower)
   5000 East Spring Street, Suite 130
   Long Beach, CA 90815

5. Location:
   ±424 gross acres generally bounded by Avenue H, Avenue G, 90th Street West, and 75th Street West
   Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs: 3219-015-001, 3219-013-001, 3219-012-001, 3268-018-900, and 3268-018-039)

6. General Plan designation:
   Existing: Non-Urban Residential (NU), Urban Residential (UR), and Park (PK)
   Proposed: NU

7. Zoning:
   Existing: RR-2.5 (Rural Residential, minimum lot size 2.5 acres), R-7,000 (single family residential, minimum lot size 7,000 square feet), and PK (Park)
   Proposed: RR-2.5

8. Description of project:

   The proposed project consists of a utility scale, 100 megawatt (MW) photovoltaic solar electric generating facility and multiple 34-kilovolt (kV) and 66 kV gen-tie lines (underground). The proposed project will operate year-round, producing electric power during daytime hours. The proposed schedule is to begin site preparation and construction of the facility in 2018 with construction completed and the facility commercially operational by the third quarter of 2019.
The proposed project will have a generating capacity of approximately 100 MW and will be located on approximately 424 gross acres (only 414 will be built on) of previously disturbed agricultural land. The project will employ photovoltaic (PV) modules that convert sunlight directly into electrical energy without the use of heat transfer fluid or cooling water. The facility will include communication lines and a 34-kV/66-kV gen-tie line(s) connecting the project to an existing approved substation on at Avenue G-12 and 100th Street West and ultimately SCE’s Antelope Substation.

The proposed project will be constructed in phases, operated for a period of at least 35 years, and consists of the following elements: PV modules; module mounting system; balance of system and electrical boxes (e.g., combiner boxes, electrical disconnects); electrical inverters and transformers; energy storage solutions; electrical AC collection system, including switchgear; data monitoring equipment, transmission and generation tie lines, and access roads and security fencing.

Solar PV Generation Facility

A series of PV module arrays will be mounted on racking systems supported typically by a pile driven foundation design. The module mounting system or racking system will be fixed tilt or tracker PV array configuration oriented to maximize the amount of incident solar radiation absorbed over the course of the year. For the tracking configuration, the modules will rotate from east to west over the course of the day.

Electrical connections from a series of PV arrays will be channeled to combiner boxes located throughout the solar field. Electrical current will be collected and combined prior to feeding the inverters. The solar field will be laid out in a common PV block design to allow adequate clearance or access roads and adequate access for maintenance. Inverters will be consolidated in areas to minimize cable routing, trenching, and minimal electrical losses. The AC output from the inverters will be routed through an AC collection system and consolidated with system switchgear. The final output from the proposed project will be processed through a transformer to match the interconnection voltage. The energy will ultimately be delivered to the SCE transmission network at the Antelope Substation.

The actual number of PV modules will depend on the technology selected, optimization evaluation and detailed design. The market conditions, economic considerations and environmental factors will be taken into account during the detailed design process. The following PV module technologies or equivalent are under consideration: PV thin-film technology; PV crystalline silicon technology; stationary fixed-tilt modular configuration; or tracking module configuration.

The module mounting system provides the structure that supports the PV module arrays. The foundations are typically steel pipes/piles driven into the soil using pneumatic or similar techniques for pile driving. Once the foundation has been installed, the module racking system will be installed to support the PV modules. For a tracking configuration, motors will be installed to drive the tracking mechanism. The module mounting system will be oriented in rows within a PV design block reflecting a standard and uniform appearance across the facility. The module configuration will typically be unique in structural height and width although the actual height of the arrays will vary based on ground elevations. Grading activity will be limited to access roads where appropriate to minimize dust generation throughout the construction and operation of the facility.
DC Collection, Inverters, AC Collection, and Transformers

Modules will be electrically connected into strings. Each string will be funneled by electrical conduit underground to combiner boxes located throughout the solar field power blocks. The output power cables from the combiner boxes will be consolidated and feed the DC electricity to inverters which convert the DC to AC.

System transformers will step up the AC power to the appropriate interconnection voltage. As required, switchgear cabinetry will be provided for circuit control. All electrical inverters, transformers, and gear will be placed on concrete foundation structures. The proposed project, including inverter equipment, will be designed and laid out in MW increments/blocks. Each inverter will be fully-enclosed, pad-mounted, and stand approximately 95 inches in height. The AC output of two inverters will be fed via underground cables into the low-voltage side of the inverter step-up transformer, generally within 20 feet of the inverters.

Energy Storage

Energy storage would include an intelligent battery system onsite. The battery storage technology is a modular fully enclosed power storage system that uses telecommunication systems and real-time control software to charge and discharge the battery according to power delivery needs. Typical modular energy storage solutions are approximately 102 inches (8.5 feet) in height and 20 to 40 feet in length. The energy storage solution would be located near inverter stations or near switchgear and will depend upon the technology chosen and needs of the overall system.

Switchgear

The potential switchgear area would be excavated for the transformer equipment, control building foundation, and oil containment area. Reinforced concrete is used for foundations. Structural components in the switchgear areas would include: transformers, switchgear, and safety systems; and footings and oil containment system for transformers. The transformer would be approximately 87 inches in height, pad mounted and enclosed together with switchgear and a junction box. The high-voltage output of the transformer would be combined in series via underground collector cable to the junction box of the transformer in closest proximity. Distances can range from 60 feet to 700 feet throughout the project site. The collector system cables would be tied at underground junction boxes to the main underground collector cables, composed of a larger gauge wire, to the location of the generator step-up transformer (GSU). The main collector cables would rise into the low-voltage busbar and protection equipment that is enclosed together with the GSU. The primary switchgear includes the main circuit breaker and utility metering equipment, and would be enclosed separately and pad mounted together with the GSU. Both the GSU and the primary switchgear stand approximately 87 inches in height. The output of the switchgear would be the start of the gen-tie.

Gen-Tie and Telecommunications

Multiple 34 kV underground gen-tie lines and up to 66 kV underground gen-tie lines will connect the proposed project to an existing approved substation located at Avenue G-12 and 100th Street West. The proposed project will connect to the substation through three potential gen-tie corridors:
West along Avenue G-8, extending south between 93th Street West and 95th Street West, extending west along Avenue G-12 to the substation;

- West along Avenue G-12 to the substation; and/or

- West along Avenue H, extending north along 100th Street West to the substation.

It is expected that one main path will be used for the gen-tie corridor, with deviations from the path as necessary. Electricity at the substation will be stepped up to 220 kV and will ultimately be delivered to the existing SCE Antelope Substation.

Data Collection System

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

Project Construction

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

Site Preparation

Construction of the PV facility will begin with initial clearing and grading (if required) of the staging areas. Access to the project site will be improved to appropriate construction standards. The staging areas will typically include construction offices, a first aid station and other temporary buildings, worker parking, truck loading and unloading facilities, and an area for assembly. Road corridors will be surveyed, cleared and graded to bring equipment, materials and workers to the areas under construction. Buried electrical lines, PV array locations and the locations of other facilities may be flagged and staked to guide construction activities. The project site will be fenced with a security fence which has a secured controlled main access gate at the entrance.

PV System Installation

PV system installation will include earthwork, grading, and erosion control, as well as erection of the PV modules, supports, and associated electrical equipment. System installation will begin with teams installing the mounting and steel/concrete piers support structures. The exact design will be finalized pending specific soil conditions. The foundation methods may include vibration drive screw piles or aboveground ballast foundations. This will be followed by panel installation and electrical work.

Concrete may be required for the footings, foundations, and will be required for pads for the transformers. Concrete will be produced at an off-site location by a local provider and transported to the project site by truck. The enclosures housing the inverters will have pre-cast concrete bases. The PV modules require a moderately flat surface for installation. Some earthwork, including grading, fill,
compaction, and erosion control cultivation may be required to accommodate the placement of PV arrays, foundations or footings, access roads and drainage features. Construction of PV arrays will include installation of support beams, module rail assemblies, PV modules, inverters, transformers, and buried electrical cables.

Construction Workers, Hours and Equipment

The construction activities are expected to be completed in approximately 10 to 14 months. Construction activities will be conducted consistent with City of Lancaster regulations regarding hours of construction. The project will generate an estimated 250 new jobs during the construction phase and will provide approximately one to two full time positions over the life of the facility for operation and maintenance activities.

Operation and Maintenance

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

Project Decommissioning

The developer will decommission and remove the system and its components at the end of the life of the facility. The project site could then be converted to other uses in accordance with applicable land use regulations in effect at that time. All decommissioning and restoration activities will adhere to the requirements of the appropriate governing authorities and will be in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and City of Lancaster regulations. A collection and recycling program will be executed to dispose of the site materials.

General Plan Amendment and Zone Change

Solar facilities are only allowed in the RR-2.5 and Heavy Industrial zones. Portions of the project site are currently zoned for urban residential and park uses. As such, the applicant is requested to change the general plan designations on two of the parcels from UR to NU and on one parcel for PK to NU. They are also requesting to change the zoning on these parcels from R-7,000 and PK to RR-2.5 in order to allow for the development of the solar facility.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The area immediately surrounding the project site is a mix of vacant land, single family homes, solar facilities, and school uses. Table 1 provides the zoning and land uses for the properties immediately adjacent to the project site. In addition to the uses identified in the table, there is a scattering of single family uses in the generally vicinity of the project site with the community of Antelope Acres more densely developed on large lots north of Avenue G. Several large scale solar developments are located west of 90th Street West and south towards Avenue L.
Table 1
Zoning/Land Use Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Zoning City</th>
<th>Zoning County</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>A-2-2.5</td>
<td>Vacant, single family home just northeast of the central part of the project site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>A-2-2.5 and A-2-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>RR-2.5, S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>RR-2.5, S (School)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

- Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) (dust control plan)
- Los Angeles County Fire Department
- Southern California Edison (interconnection agreement)
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Regional Water Quality Control Board – Lahontan

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

In accordance with Senate Bill (SB) 18 and Assembly Bill (AB) 52, the City sent letters to a total of six tribes (seven individuals) that have either been identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) or that have directly contacted the City for notification via certified, return receipt mail on February 8, 2018. These letters included copies of the site plan, cultural resources report, and an aerial photograph along with the offer to consult on the project. Table 2 identifies the six tribes, the person whose attention the letter was directed to, and the date the letter was received.
The City received responses from three of the tribes: San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians. The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians has no specific concerns regarding the proposed project; however, they have requested specific language be included to address cultural resources in the event that previously unknown resources are identified during construction. This mitigation measure has been included in the cultural resources section.

The Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians sent an email stating that they are interested in participating consultation and requesting additional information. Most of the information the Tribe is requesting be provided on the form was already provided on the proposed site plan and cultural resources report that was sent with the original letter. A mitigation measure has been added requiring the applicant to consult with the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians and address any concerns prior to the issuance of any construction related permits.

No other tribes have responded to the SB 18/AB 52 consultation letter.

---

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Person/Title</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>Kimia Fatehi/ Tribal Historic and Cultural Preservation Officer</td>
<td>February 9, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serrano Nation of Mission Indians</td>
<td>Goldie Walker/ Chairperson</td>
<td>February 14, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>John Valenzuela/ Chairperson</td>
<td>February 9, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation</td>
<td>Andrew Salas/ Chairman</td>
<td>February 9, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morongo Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>Robert Martin/Chairperson</td>
<td>February 12, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morongo Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>Denisa Torres/Cultural Resources Manager</td>
<td>February 12, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Manuel Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>Lee Clauss/ Director of Cultural Resources</td>
<td>February 9, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture and Forest Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Biological Resources</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Geology/Soils</th>
<th>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</th>
<th>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Hydrology/Water Quality</th>
<th>Land Use/Planning</th>
<th>Mineral Resources</th>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Population/Housing</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Transportation/Traffic</th>
<th>Tribal Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Utilities/Service Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION - On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

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

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

Jocelyn Swain, Principal Planner

Date 7/12/2018
EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

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

4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rev. 3
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8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
   
a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.
I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project, and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

| a) | Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | X |
| b) | Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | X |
| c) | Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | X |
| d) | Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? | X |
### VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, involving:**
  - i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. **X**
  - ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? **X**
  - iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? **X**
  - iv) Landslides? **X**

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

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

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

- **e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for disposal of waste water?** **X**
### VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably fore-seeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

Would the project:

<p>| | | | |
| | | | |
|---|---|---|
| a) | Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | | X |
| b) | Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | | X |
| c) | Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | | X |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XI. MINERAL RESOURCES** – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XII. NOISE** -- Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

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

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

Fire protection?  X

Police protection?  X

Schools?  X

Parks?  X
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other public facilities?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XV. RECREATION --**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC --** Would the project:

a) Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resources, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe and that is:

a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or

b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set for in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significant of the resource to a California Native American tribe.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS  -- Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

I. **AESTHETICS**

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

With implementation of the proposed project, the available views of the identified scenic resources would not change and would continue to be available from the roadways and area surrounding the project site. The change in the project site would be visible;
however, the project site would be fenced and screened with landscaping/native plants along the perimeter where visible from existing or major planned roadways including Avenue G, Avenue H, and 90th Street West. The height of the PV panels would be approximately 8 to 10 feet depending upon the technology selected and would not exceed 14 feet. This is substantially lower than a single family home. The height of the development would not impede views of the mountains while traveling on any of the surrounding roadways. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b. The proposed project would not remove any scenic resources such as rock outcroppings and trees, although some tamarisks are located on the project site. There is a house and associated buildings located on approximately 10 acres of the 424-acre site along Avenue H. The structures on the 10 acres will remain undisturbed and will not be developed with solar panels. There are some former residential structures on other portions of the project site that will be removed. Additionally, the project site is not located in the vicinity of any State Scenic Highways. 90th Street West, from Avenue K to the Kern County line, has been designated by the City of Lancaster’s General Plan as a Scenic Route; however, the proposed project would not change the available views that make the roadway scenic (long range views of the mountains). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c. The proposed project would change the visual character of the project site in that it would replace fallow and active agricultural fields and disturbed desert with photovoltaic solar electric generating facilities. While this would change the character of the existing site, the proposed project would be compatible with the large-scale transmission lines in the area, the Southern California Edison Substations on the southeast corner of Avenue H and 90th Street West (Del Sur Substation) and Avenue J and 90th Street West (Antelope Substation), and the existing solar facilities to the south and west of the project site. The height of the PV panels is estimated at approximately 10 feet and they would not exceed 14 feet. The inverters, transformers, and battery storage facilities would be approximately 7.5 feet in height. Additionally, the proposed project would have a 10-foot landscaped area along major existing and future roadways. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d. The proposed project would create new sources of lighting from security and perimeter lighting. The area surrounding the project site has some ambient lighting predominantly from the single family residential uses scattered around the project site, lighting from the Del Sur Substation and Del Sur Elementary School, and vehicle headlights/streetlights along Avenue H, Avenue G, and 90th Street West. The lighting on the project site would be shielded and focused downward. No sources of glare are anticipated on the project site as the PV panels are designed to absorb sunlight, not reflect it. Any structures on the project site would be constructed from non-reflective materials to the extent feasible. The water tanks required by the fire department would be painted a neutral color. Therefore, light and glare impacts would be less than significant.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

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

The maps for each county are updated every two years. The Los Angeles County Farmland Map was last updated in 2016. Based on the 2016 map, the project site is designated as a mix of Prime Farmland, Grazing Land, and Other Land. A large portion of the project site (bounded by Avenue G-8, Avenue H, 80th Street West and 90th Street) is designated as Prime Farmland although some portions are designated as Grazing and Other Land. The remainder of the project site is designated as grazing land and other land.

Prime Farmland is defined as having “the best combination of physical and chemical features able to sustain long-term agricultural production. This land has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields. Land must have been used for irrigated agricultural production at some time during the four years prior to the mapping date.” While approximately 300 acres of the project site has this designation and portions are still utilized for agricultural production, the recent adjudication of the ground water basin and ongoing drought conditions have limited the amount of ground water that may be pumped. As a result, crops that require substantial amounts of water, such as alfalfa, grapes, onions, etc. may no longer be economically viable. Additionally, development of the project site as a solar facility would result in minimal amounts of grading as grading is restricted to roadways and inverter/transformer pads. As such, the topsoil would remain on the project site and the solar generating facility would not prevent the site from being utilized for agricultural production in the future. As such, impacts to farmland would be less than significant.

Grazing land is defined as “land on which the existing vegetation is suited to the grazing of livestock”. Other Land is defined as “land not included in any other mapping category. Common examples include low density rural developments, brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing, confined livestock, poultry, or aquaculture facilities, strip mines, borrow pits, and water bodies smaller than 40 acres. Vacant and nonagricultural land surrounded on all sides by urban development and greater than 40 acres is mapped as other land.” Neither grazing land or other land is categorized as farmland of importance by the State. As these portions of the project site are not designated as farmland of importance by the State nor are they currently utilized for agricultural purposes, no impacts to agricultural resources would occur.

b. The portions of the project site that are zoned as RR-2.5 allow for agricultural uses and the zoning on the remainder of the project site is being changed to RR-2.5. While some portions of the project are currently for agricultural production, the property owner has leased/sold the property for solar development. The proposed project consists of the development and operation of a photovoltaic solar electric generating facility and would not interfere with other agricultural uses (e.g., ranches, etc.) in the area. Additionally, the project site or surrounding area is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
c-d. According to the City of Lancaster’s General Plan, there are no forests or timberlands located within the City of Lancaster. Therefore, the proposed projects would not result in the rezoning of forest or timberland and would not cause the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest land. No impacts would occur.

c. See responses to Items IIa-d.

III. AIR QUALITY

a. Development proposed under the City of Lancaster’s General Plan would not create air emissions that exceed the Air Quality Management Plan (GPEIR pgs. 5.5-21 to 5.5-22). The proposed project consists of the construction and operation of a photovoltaic solar electric generating facility. The proposed project was not accounted for under the City’s General Plan as approximately 124 acres of the project site are designated and zoned for urban residential and park uses. The applicant is seeking a general plan amendment and zone change to change the designations on these properties to NU and the zoning to RR-2.5 which would allow the construction of the proposed project with a conditional use permit. This is a substantially less intensive use than the urban residential and park uses. Therefore, any air emissions generated by the proposed project have already been accounted for and the project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan and impacts would be less than significant.

b. The air emissions associated with the construction and operation of the proposed project were estimated utilizing the latest version of CalEEMod (Version 2016.3.2; last updated November 9, 2017). CalEEMod was designed in collaboration with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and other California air districts to calculate air and greenhouse gas emissions associated with land use projects. The results of this analysis was documented in a technical memorandum prepared by SWCA Environmental Consultants and entitled “Technical Memorandum Regarding San Pablo A Solar Project – Air Quality Impact Assessment” and dated May 24, 2018.

The project site is within the boundaries of the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) and therefore, the project’s estimated air emissions were compared to the thresholds established by the AVAQMD. These thresholds were identified in the AVAQMD’s California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Federal Conformity Guidelines document, dated August 2016 and are summarized below in Table 3.

Air emissions associated with the construction of the proposed project were calculated and compared to the AVAQMD thresholds. These emissions were generated using information such as the number of days for particular activities (e.g., demolition, grading, etc.) and the number and types of equipment necessary. Additionally, the calculations assume that the following would occur as part of the proposed project: exposed areas of the project site would be water three times per day; speeds on site would be reduced to 15 miles per hour; and soil stabilizer would be applied to disturbed areas. These emissions are shown in Table 4. As can be seen from the table, construction emissions would be less than the AVAQMD thresholds and impacts would be less than significant.
Operational air emissions are shown in Table 5. As shown in this table, the operational emissions associated with the proposed project would not exceed the AVAQMD’s significance thresholds. Therefore, operational impacts would be less than significant.

A discussion of dust control measures during construction and operation of the proposed project can be found under Item VI.b and a discussion of valley fever can be found under Item III.d.
The proposed project, in conjunction with other development as allowed by the General Plan, would result in a cumulative increase in pollutants. However, since the emissions associated with the construction and operation of the proposed project would be less than significant; the project’s contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.

c. The closest sensitive receptors to the project are the three single family residences at the southeast and northeast corners of 80th Street West and Avenue H; the single family residence at the southeast corner of 80th Street West and Avenue G; the single family residence northeast of the central portion of the project site; and the Del Sur Elementary School located on the northwest corner of 90th Street West and Avenue H. Additionally, other single family homes are scattered throughout the general vicinity of the project site and the community of Antelope Acres is located north of Avenue G. Based on the amount of traffic expected to be generated by the proposed project, no significant traffic impacts would be anticipated. Additionally, the air emissions from the construction or operation of the proposed project would not exceed the thresholds established by the AVAQMD. Therefore, substantial pollutant concentrations would not occur and impacts would be less than significant.

However, since the construction of the proposed project would result in the disturbance of the soil, it is possible individuals could be exposed to Valley Fever. Valley Fever or coccidioidomycosis, is primarily a disease of the lungs caused by the spores of the *Coccidioides immitis* fungus. The spores are found in soils, become airborne when the soil is disturbed, and are subsequently inhaled into the lungs. After the fungal spores have settled in the lungs, they change into a multicellular structure called a spherule. Fungal growth in the lungs occurs as the spherule grows and bursts, releasing endospores, which then develop into more spherules.

Valley Fever is not contagious, and therefore, cannot be passed on from person to person. Most of those who are infected would recover without treatment within six months and

---

**Table 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Peak Annual Emissions (tons)</th>
<th>Annual Threshold (tons)</th>
<th>Threshold Exceeded?</th>
<th>Peak Daily Emissions (pounds)</th>
<th>Daily Threshold (pounds)</th>
<th>Threshold Exceeded?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO₂e</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5,276.51</td>
<td>548,000</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>17.84</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOₓ</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>28.77</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOₓ</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₁₀</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₂.₅</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂S</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pb</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
would have a life-long immunity to the fungal spores. In severe cases, especially in those patients with rapid and extensive primary illness, those who are at risk for dissemination of disease, and those who have disseminated disease, antifungal drug therapy is used.

Nearby sensitive receptors as well as workers at the project site could be exposed to Valley Fever from fugitive dust generated during construction. There is the potential that cocci spores would be stirred up during excavation, grading, and earth-moving activities, exposing construction workers and nearby sensitive receptors to these spores and thereby to the potential of contracting Valley Fever. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures 11-15 (see Geology and Soils) which requires the project operator to implement dust control measures in compliance with AVAQMD Rule 403, and implementation of Mitigation Measure 1, below, which would provide personal protective respiratory equipment to construction workers and provide information to all construction personnel and visitors about Valley Fever, the risk of exposure to Valley Fever would be minimized to a less than significant level.

1. Prior to ground disturbance activities, the project operator shall provide evidence to the Development Services Director that the project operator and/or construction manager has developed a “Valley Fever Training Handout”, training, and schedule of sessions for education to be provided to all construction personnel. All evidence of the training session materials, handout(s) and schedule shall be submitted to the Development Services Director within 24 hours of the first training session. Multiple training sessions may be conducted if different work crews will come to the site for different stages of construction; however, all construction personnel shall be provided training prior to beginning work. The evidence submitted to the Development Services Director regarding the “Valley Fever Training Handout” and Session(s) shall include the following:

- A sign-in sheet (to include the printed employee names, signature, and date) for all employees who attended the training session.
- Distribution of a written flier or brochure that includes educational information regarding the health effects of exposure to criteria pollutant emissions and Valley Fever.
- Training on methods that may help prevent Valley Fever infection.
- A demonstration to employees on how to use personal protective equipment, such as respiratory equipment (masks), to reduce exposure to pollutants and facilitate recognition of symptoms and earlier treatment of Valley Fever. Where respirators are required, the equipment shall be readily available and shall be provided to employees for use during work. Proof that the demonstration is included in the training shall be submitted to the county. This proof can be via printed training materials/agenda, DVD, digital media files, or photographs.

The project operator also shall consult with the Los Angeles County Public Health to develop a Valley Fever Dust Management Plan that addresses the potential presence of the Coccidioides spore and mitigates for the potential for Coccidioidomycosis (Valley Fever). Prior to issuance of permits, the project operator
shall submit the Plan to the Los Angeles County Public Health for review and approval. The Plan shall include a program to evaluate the potential for exposure to Valley Fever from construction activities and to identify appropriate safety procedures that shall be implemented, as needed, to minimize personnel and public exposure to potential Coccidioides spores. Measures in the Plan shall include the following:

- Provide HEP-filters for heavy equipment equipped with factory enclosed cabs capable of accepting the filters. Cause contractors utilizing applicable heavy equipment to furnish proof of worker training on proper use of applicable heavy equipment cabs, such as turning on air conditioning prior to using the equipment.
- Provide communication methods, such as two-way radios, for use in enclosed cabs.
- Require National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH)-approved half-face respirators equipped with minimum N-95 protection factor for use during worker collocation with surface disturbance activities, as required per the hazard assessment process.
- Cause employees to be medically evaluated, fit-tested, and properly trained on the use of the respirators, and implement a full respiratory protection program in accordance with the applicable Cal/OSHA Respiratory Protection Standard (8 CCR 5144).
- Provide separate, clean eating areas with hand-washing facilities.
- Install equipment inspection stations at each construction equipment access/egress point. Examine construction vehicles and equipment for excess soil material and clean, as necessary, before equipment is moved off-site.
- Train workers to recognize the symptoms of Valley Fever, and to promptly report suspected symptoms of work-related Valley Fever to a supervisor.
- Work with a medical professional to develop a protocol to medically evaluate employees who develop symptoms of Valley Fever.
- Work with a medical professional, in consultation with the Los Angeles County Public Health, to develop an educational handout for on-site workers and surrounding residents within three miles of the project site, and include the following information on Valley Fever: what are the potential sources/ causes, what are the common symptoms, what are the options or remedies available should someone be experiencing these symptoms, and where testing for exposure is available. Prior to construction permit issuance, this handout shall have been created by the project operator and reviewed by the project operator and reviewed by the Development Services Director. No less than 30 days prior to any work commencing, this handout shall be mailed to all existing residences within three miles of the project boundaries.
- When possible, position workers upwind or crosswind when digging a trench or performing other soil-disturbing tasks.
Prohibit smoking at the worksite outside of designated smoking areas; designated smoking areas will be equipped with handwashing facilities.

- Post warnings on-site and consider limiting access to visitors, especially those without adequate training and respiratory protection.
- Audit and enforce compliance with relevant Cal OSHA health and safety standards on the job site.

e. Construction and operation of the proposed project is not anticipated to produce significant objectionable odors. Construction equipment may generate some odors, but these odors would be similar to those produced by vehicles traveling along Avenue G, Avenue H, and 90th Street West. Most objectionable odors are typically associated with industrial projects involving the use of chemicals, solvents, petroleum products and other strong smelling elements used in manufacturing processes, as well as sewage treatment facilities and landfills. These types of uses are not part of the proposed project. The proposed project would not generate any odors as it is a photovoltaic solar electric generating facility and no odorous chemicals would be utilized. Small amounts of dielectric fluid and mineral oil would be utilized in the operation and maintenance of the transformers and electrical components. These materials would not have a noticeable odor. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

a. A biological resource survey was conducted for the project site by SWCA Environmental Consultants and documented in a report entitled “Biological Resources Report for the San Pablo A Solar Project, Los Angeles County, California” and dated February 2, 2018. The following summarizes the results of this survey. As part of the preparation of the report, the following databases were queried for data relevant to the project site: CDFW California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) RareFind 5; California Native Plant Society Online Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants; eBird’s web-based bird database; USFWS web-based Wetland Mapper; EPA My Waters Mapper; and USDA web soil survey.

A field survey of the project site was conducted on November 9, 2017. Three vegetation communities were mapped within the project area: Red Brome Grasslands (Bromus madritensis ssp. tubens), Rubber Rabbitbrush scrub (Ericameria nauseosa), and four-wing saltbush scrub (Atriplex canescens). In addition to these vegetation types, additional cover types were also mapped including disturbed/ruderal, developed and agricultural fields. Agricultural fields included hay and alfalfa fields and vineyards. Table 6 provides a list of the plant species that were identified on site during the project surveys. The common name of the plant is provided followed by the scientific name in ( ). There are no records for the project site of sensitive plant species in the existing databases and no special status plant species were observed during the survey.

Table 7 provides a list of the wildlife species observed on the project site during the site surveys. Based on a literature and database review, it was determined that 23 sensitive
wildlife species were found within a 9-quad records search and 15 of these sensitive wildlife species have the potential to occur on the project.

While burrowing owls were not observed on the project site, it is possible that burrowing owls could occupy the prior to the start of construction activities. As such, a mitigation measure has been added for protocol surveys and buffer zones (in the event that they are present) to ensure impacts are less than significant.

**Table 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean schismus (Schismus barbatus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prickly lettuce (Lactuca serriola)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allscale (Atriplex polycarpa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rubber rabbitbrush (Ericameria nauseosa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goldfields (Lasthenia sp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sand-aster (Corethogyne filaginifolia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common sunflower (Helianthus annuus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda grass (Cynodon dactylon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English plantain (Plantago lanceolata)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European grape (Vitis vinifera)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red brome (Bromus madritensis subsp. tubens)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wildlife Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>red-tailed hawk (Buteo jamaicensis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black phoebe (Sayornis nigricans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common raven (Corvus corax)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black-tailed jackrabbit (Lepus californicus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>savannah sparrow (Passerculus sandwichensis)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The project site contains suitable foraging habitat for raptors including loggershrike, northern harrier and Swainson’s hawk; however, not suitable nesting habitat is present on the project site. Because of their mobility, birds generally move out of harm’s way and would not be injured or killed during grading, construction or project operations. The CNDDB includes several records of Swainson’s hawk nests within 10 miles of the project site and two nest sites within a 5-mile radius. The Audubon Society also provided a map with locations of known Swainson’s hawk nests. As there is suitable foraging habitat elsewhere within the Antelope Valley and no nesting habitat is located on the project site, impacts to Swainson’s hawk are not anticipated occur. However, mitigation has been included to ensure that impacts to this species are less than significant.

While no evidence of American badger or desert kit fox were encountered during the survey of the project site, suitable habitat is available on the site. There is no protocol survey required for these species; instead mitigation measures to ensure that they are not directly impacted are typically implemented. These measures have been included. With implementation of the identified mitigation measures, impacts to biological resources would be less than significant.

2. Burrowing owl protocol surveys shall be conducted on the project site prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities in accordance with established burrowing owl protocols. If burrowing owls are identified using the project site, buffer areas where no activity occurs shall be established around the occupied burrows. A buffer of 50-meters shall be established during the non-breeding season and the buffer zone increased to 75-meters during the breeding season.

3. A Swainson’s hawk survey shall be conducted on the project site prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities in accordance with established Swainson’s hawk protocols. No construction shall occur within 0.5 miles of an active Swainson’s hawk nest or within 500 feet of active nests for other raptors.

4. A nesting bird survey shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities. If nesting birds are encountered, all work in the area shall cease until either the young birds have fledged or the appropriate permits are obtained from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

5. A pre-construction coast horned lizard and silvery legless lizard survey shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities. If coast horned lizards or silvery legless lizards are discovered during the survey, the applicant shall contact the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to determine the appropriate mitigation/management requirements for the species.

6. A preconstruction survey for American badger and desert kit fox shall be conducted no more than 30 days prior to the start of construction. In the event that potential dens are observed, the following buffer distances shall be established prior to construction activities:

- Desert kit fox or American badger potential den: 30 feet
Desert kit fox active den: 100 feet

Desert kit fox natal den: 500 feet

If avoidance of potential dens is not possible, the following measures shall be enacted:

- If the qualified biologist determines that potential dens are inactive, the biologist shall excavate these dens by hand with a shovel to prevent foxes from re-using them during construction.

- If the qualified biologist determines that potential dens may be active, an on-site passive relocation program shall be implemented. This program shall consist of excluding foxes from occupied burrows by installation of one way doors at burrow entrances, monitoring of the burrow for one week to confirm usage has been discontinued, and excavation and collapse of the burrow to prevent reoccupation. After the qualified biologist determines that badgers and foxes have stopped using active dens within the project boundary, the dens shall be hand-excavated with a shovel to prevent re-use during construction.

b. A jurisdictional delineation was conducted by SWCA Environmental Consultants and documented in a report entitled: Existing Conditions Jurisdictional Delineation Report for the San Pablo A Solar Project, Los Angeles County, California and dated February 2, 2018. The report encompasses the 424 gross acres of the project site along with the three proposed gen-tie routes.

On November 9, 2017 a survey of the project site was conducted to determine the structure and composition of on-site hydrology, vegetation and soils. Water moves through much of the project site via sheet flow and produces erosional features, such as bed, banks and ordinary high water mark (OHWM). Many of the historical drainages with the project site have been removed due to the on-site agricultural practices and residences. A total of ten potential hydrological features were identified on the project site and along the potential gen-tie routes. These features consisted of abandoned agricultural ponds, erosional features, swales, a historical CDFW feature and a discontinuous ephemeral stream.

A total of two of these features had characteristics of regulated jurisdictional water features, all located along the gen-tie routes. Table 8 provides details regarding these delineated features. The top of the bank and OHWM were mapped for each feature when applicable. None of the features has vegetation associated with riparian habitat.
Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) jurisdiction is over the waters of the State defined by the area within the OHWM of each of the linear features delineated along the gen-tie route, which total approximately 0.01 acres. These features are relatively narrow and it may be possible to avoid impacts through project design of the pole location or directional drilling. In the event that impacts cannot be avoided, a Waste Discharge Report (WDR) permit from the Lahontan RWQCB for discharges of dredged or fill materials to waters of the State would be required.

CDFW jurisdictional streambeds and banks total approximately 4.21 acres and most of them parallel the Avenue H gen-tie option. No riparian vegetation that would have extended the jurisdictional limits beyond bank-top to bank-top bordered these features. Feature Nos. 9a and 9b were previously mapped in support of the Del Sur Solar Project LSAA No. 1600-2015-0231-R5. They have since been altered due to construction of the Del Sur Solar Project and/or natural events. If impacts from the San Pablo A solar project are kept within the previously permitted disturbed areas, there would be no new impacts or the need for additional permitting. In the event that impacts cannot be avoided, a LSAA from CDFW would be required.

7. The applicant shall consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to determine whether or not a Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement is required prior to any work occurring within the delineated features along the potential gen-tie routes. If a Streambed Alteration Agreement is required, it shall be obtained prior to the issuance of any permits (e.g., grading, etc.).

8. The applicant shall coordinate with the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board to determine whether the applicant is required to obtain a Report of Waste Discharge prior to any work occurring within the delineated features along the potential gen-tie routes. If this permit is required, it shall be obtained prior to the issuance of any permits (e.g., grading, etc.).
c. There are no federally protected wetlands on the project site as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

d. While some animal species may move across the project site, the area is highly fragmented and contains many man-made barriers. The project site is not part of an established migratory wildlife corridor. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

a-d. A cultural resources survey was conducted for the proposed project by BCR Consulting LLC. This survey was documented in a report entitled “Cultural Resources Assessment, San Pablo A Solar Project, City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California” and dated February 2, 2018.

Prior to fieldwork, a records search was conducted using records from the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC). This archival research reviewed the status of all recorded historic and prehistoric cultural resources, and survey and excavation reports completed within one mile of the study area; the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register, and documents and inventories published by the California Office of Historic Preservation. A total of nine previous cultural resource studies have taken place and three cultural resources have been recorded within a mile of the project site/study area. One of these studies has assessed portions of the project site/study area and no cultural resources were recorded. In addition, a Sacred Lands File Search was requested from the Native American Heritage Commission for the project site with negative results.

Additional research has indicated that the project site has been occupied or partially occupied by three alfalfa farms: Richard J Long Property, West Avenue G-4 Property, and the Cameo Ranch and Winery.

A field survey of the project site and study area was conducted between November 8 and December 11, 2017 by walking pedestrian transects spaced approximately 15 meters apart. This included the block portions and the linear alignment (gen-tie) plus a 90-foot buffer where accessible. During the field survey, the three historic alfalfa farms and one prehistoric isolated flake were identified. These resources are described below.

Richard Long Property: The Richard Long property consists of two separate residences on approximately 40 acres of former farmland. Residence 1 was built in 1930 and is a two bedroom, single bath home with a concrete foundation. It is wood frame construction covered with imitation brick veneer and an asphalt composition gable roof. Residence 2 was built in 1967 and is a three bedroom, three-bath wood-frame stucco home. This residence was built on a concrete foundation and has a hip and valley wood shake roof. A large multi-car garage is attached to the home and is accessed through a single wooden
door. A small pathway leads south from the southeast corner of the home and ends 43 feet from the residence. No other features were noted on the property. This portion of the project is not eligible for listing in the California under any of the four criteria and therefore is not considered a historical resource under CEQA and impacts would be less than significant.

**West Avenue G-4 Property:** This resource consists of a four-bedroom, two bath single family residence with an attached two car garage on approximately 40 acres of former farmland. The residence was constructed with a wooden frame covered by sheets of low-density fiber board and dressed in horizontal wood shingles. The building rests on a concrete foundation and has an “L” shaped floor plan with a hipped roof. Vertical wood siding covers a portion of the front of the residence as well as a raised roof hip. The roof contains numerous layers of asphalt composition roof shingles indicating that older roofing material was never removed. The windows and doors have been boarded. This portion of the project is not eligible for listing in the California under any of the four criteria and therefore is not considered historical resources under CEQA and impacts would be less than significant.

**The Cameo Ranch and Winery:** The Cameo Ranch and Winery comprise a 306-acre vineyard and alfalfa farm containing two historic period residences, three historic period structures and one modern barn. A total of 23 acres were reserved for a vineyard and the balance was divided between vacant land and alfalfa cultivation. Residence 1 is a two bedroom, two bath home built in 1917 on a concrete foundation and a porch on elevated beams approximately 3 feet off of the ground. The wood frame is dressed in horizontal clapboard siding accompanied by original double hung and quad pane windows. Residence 2 is a four-bedroom, two bath home built in 1924 and heavily altered in 1978. Three historic period structures are also present on the subject property. Structure 1 is constructed of unpainted milled lumber and is in a state of disrepair. Structures 2 and 3 are also constructed from unpainted milled lumber with a corrugated tin roof fastened to wooden studs. This portion of the project is not eligible for listing in the California under any of the four criteria and therefore is not considered historical resources under CEQA and impacts would be less than significant. However, these structures are located on the 10 acres of the project site that would not be developed and therefore, they would remain in their present condition.

**SPO1706-I-1:** This is an isolated prehistoric interior rhyolite flake measuring 5 by 3.5 by 0.8 centimeters with no further touchup. No other archaeological materials were found in the vicinity. Isolated finds are not considered historical resources under CEQA.

Development of the project site would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or geologic feature. No human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, were discovered on the project site. No impacts would be anticipated to occur to cultural resources. However, while the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians has no concerns regarding the proposed project, they have requested specific language be included to address cultural resources in the event that previously unknown resources are identified during construction. In addition to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission
Indians contacted the City as discussed in Item 11 on page 8. In order to address any concerns the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians may have, the applicant is required to contact this tribe as discussed in the mitigation measure below. With incorporation of the identified mitigation measures, impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant.

9. In the event that previously unknown cultural resources are identified during construction, the following requirements shall apply:

i. If human remains or funerary objects are encountered during any construction activities associated with the proposed project, work within a 100-foot buffer shall cease and the County Coroner shall be contacted pursuant to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5.

ii. In the event that Native American cultural resources are discovered during any construction activities all work within a 60-foot buffer shall cease and a qualified archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior standards shall be hired to assess the find. The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians shall be contacted and provided information and invited to perform a site visit in conjunction with the archaeologist to provide Tribal input.

iii. If significant Native American resources are discovered and avoidance cannot be ensured a Secretary of the Interior qualified archaeologist shall be retained to develop a cultural resource Treatment Plan, as well as a Discovery and Monitoring Plan. A copy of the draft document shall be provided to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians for review and comment. All in field investigation, assessment and/or data recovery pursuant to the Treatment Plan shall be monitored by a Tribal Monitor. Additionally, the applicant and City of Lancaster shall consult with the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians on the disposition and treatment of any artifacts or other cultural materials encountered during the project.

10. The applicant shall in good faith contact the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians to discuss and address concerns associated with the development of the site. A copy of any concerns and the proposed resolution/agreement shall be submitted to the City prior to the issuance of permits.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

a. The project site is not identified as being in or in proximity to a fault rupture zone (LMEA Figure 2-5). According to the Seismic Hazard Evaluation of the Lancaster East and West Quadrangles, the project sites may be subject to intense seismic shaking (LMEA pg. 2-16). However, the proposed project would be constructed in accordance with the seismic requirements of the Uniform Building Code (UBC) as adopted by the City, which would render any potential impacts to a less than significant level. The project site is generally level and is not subject to landslides (SSHZ).
Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which the strength and stiffness of a soil is reduced by earthquake shaking or other events. This phenomenon occurs in saturated soils that undergo intense seismic shaking typically associated with an earthquake. There are three specific conditions that need to be in place for liquefaction to occur: loose granular soils, shallow groundwater (usually less than 50 feet below the ground surface) and intense seismic shaking. In February 2005, the California Geologic Survey updated the Seismic Hazard Zones Maps for Lancaster (SSHZ). Based on these maps, the project site is not in an area at risk for liquefaction. No impacts would occur.

b. Portions of the project site are rated as having a “none to slight” and “moderate” risk for soil erosion (USDA SCS Maps) when cultivated or cleared of vegetation. The proposed project consists of the construction and operation of a 100 MW photovoltaic solar electric generating facility and associated infrastructure (e.g., inverter, transformers, battery storage, etc.). Minimal grading would be done in order to construct the proposed project. Perimeter and access roads will be graded to comply with Fire Department standards and the pads for the inverters, transformers, and battery storage will be graded. These pads will be paved to provide the foundation for the equipment. The remainder of the project site, where the PV panels will be installed, will not be graded. However, there remains a potential for water and wind erosion during construction. The proposed project would be required, under the provisions of the Lancaster Municipal Code (LMC) Chapter 8.16, to adequately wet or seal the soil to prevent wind erosion. Additionally, the following mitigation measures shall be required to control dust/wind erosion.

11. The applicant shall submit a Dust Control Plan to the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) for review and approval in accordance with Rule 403, Fugitive Dust, prior to the issuance of any grading and/or construction permits. This plan shall demonstrate adequate water or dust suppressant application equipment to mitigate all disturbed areas.

12. When water is used for dust control, water shall occur three times per day and shall be increased to four times per day when there is evidence of visible wind driven fugitive dust.

13. Signage shall be displayed on the project site in accordance with AVAQMD Rule 403 (Appendix A).

14. All disturbed surfaces shall meet the definition of a stabilized surface upon completion of project construction.

15. The applicant shall submit an Active Operation Dust Control Plan for Renewable Energy Projects to the AVAQMD upon project completion. This plan shall be updated and renewed annually and must be in place for the life of the project.

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

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

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

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

a-b. The proposed project involves the construction and operation of photovoltaic solar electric generating facility. This facility would ultimately connect into the SCE Antelope Substation. As discussed in Item III.b, the proposed project would generate air emissions during construction activities. It is anticipated that construction activities would generate approximately 12,976.86 pounds of greenhouse gases per day or 1,258.56 tons per year which is well below the thresholds established by the AVAQMD and would not prevent the State from reaching its greenhouse gas reduction targets. Operation of the proposed project would generate minimal amounts of emissions, primarily from vehicles when site maintenance is required. The actual photovoltaic facilities (excluded maintenance related activities) would not generate emissions during operation and would therefore help to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases emitted during the production of electricity. It is estimated by the applicant, that the operation of the facility would offset approximately 202,415 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent annually that would have been produced from the creation of electricity from fossil fuels. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed project would be in compliance with the greenhouse gas goals and policies identified in the City of Lancaster’s General Plan (pgs. 2-19 to 2-24) and with the City’s Climate Action Plan. Specifically, the City’s Climate Action Plan identifies the need to increase the amount of utility scale solar development and utility scale battery storage to help achieve a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, impacts with respect to conflicts with an agency’s plan, policies, or regulations would be less than significant.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

a-b. The proposed project consists of the construction and operation of a 100 MW solar electric generating facility on approximately 424 gross acres. The proposed project would
use minimal amounts of hazardous materials during construction activities. During operation, the only hazardous materials that would be utilized are dielectric fluid and mineral oil. Use of all materials would be in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations. The proposed project is not located along a hazardous materials/waste transportation corridor (LMEA Figure 9.1-4). Several former residences are located on the project site that would be demolished during the course of project construction. Due to the age of these structures, it is possible that they contain asbestos and lead-based paint. Prior to the demolition of the structures, the structures shall be tested for both asbestos and lead-based paint and if present abated in accordance with existing rules and regulations. These procedures are identified in the following mitigation measures. With compliance of the identified mitigation measures, impacts from hazardous materials would be less than significant.

16. Prior to any demolition activities associated with the existing residential structures, an asbestos survey shall be conducted to determine the presence or absence of asbestos and the results shall be submitted to the City. If asbestos containing materials are located, abatement of the asbestos shall be completed prior to demolition activities. Asbestos removal shall be performed by a State certified asbestos containment contractor in accordance with AVAQMD Rule 1403.

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

c. The project site is located within a quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Del Sur Elementary is located on the northwest corner of 90th Street West and Avenue H, directly west of the project site. However, the proposed project would not generate hazardous emissions. Emissions generated during construction would be similar to those emitted by vehicles traveling on Avenue H and 90th Street West. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for the project site by Terracon Consultants, Inc. The results of the study are documented in a report entitled “Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, San Pablo A Solar, Northeast of West Avenue H and 90th Street West, Lancaster, Los Angeles County” and dated February 2, 2018.

A site visit was conducted on the project site on November 9, 2017 to determine the presence of any recognized environmental concerns. The site is improved with Cameo Ranch and Winery and single-family residences. The project site consists of approximately 347-acres of agricultural land improved with single-family residences, two warehouse buildings, and an open storage hay barn associated with the Cameo Ranch and Winery; a vacant single-family residence on the northern portion, two water wells, and two dry reservoirs; approximately 38- acres of fallow agricultural land; and 39-acres of primarily fallow agricultural land and remnants of three apparent residences, two
vacant residences, and a dry reservoir. Operations consist of agricultural practices including equipment maintenance and fueling on the south central portion.

**Other processes or equipment**

Various farming equipment was observed on the south-central portion of the site. Soil staining and/or releases were not observed in the vicinity of the farming equipment. Based on visual observations during the site reconnaissance, the farming equipment does not constitute a REC to the site.

**Aboveground storage tanks (ASTs)**

A total of 15 ASTs were observed on the site during the site reconnaissance. The following describes the ASTs observed. Unless otherwise noted, soil staining and/or releases were not observed.

- Three approximately 50-gallon propane ASTs were observed on the south central portion.
- Three approximately 250-gallon propane ASTs were observed on the south central portion.
- Two approximately 500-gallon propane ASTs were observed on the south central portion.
- One approximately 500-gallon gasoline AST was observed on the south central portion.
- One approximately 250-gallon AST with unknown contents was observed on the south central portion.
- Two approximately 5,000-gallon water silos were observed on the south central portion. These silos appear to have been used for water storage.
- One approximately 10,000-gallon water silo was observed on the south central portion. This silo appears to have been use for hay storage.
- Two approximately 500-gallon diesel ASTs were observed on the south central portion. Approximately 140 square feet of significant soil/unpaved staining was observed in the vicinity of the two 500-gallon diesel ASTs during the site reconnaissance, which represents a REC to the site.

**Drums, barrels and/or containers ≥5 gallons**

A total of three 250-gallon totes, 58 55-gallons drums, and five 5-gallon containers were observed on the site during the site reconnaissance. Unless otherwise noted, no soil staining and/or releases were observed.

- Two 250-gallon totes with unknown contents were observed on the south central portion.
- 32 empty 55-gallon metal drums were observed on the south central portion and
one 55-gallon drum was observed on the west portion.

- 16 empty 55-gallon plastic drums were observed on the south central portion.
- Three empty 5-gallon containers were observed on the south central portion.
- One empty 5-gallon container was observed on the north portion.
- One 5-gallon used oil container was observed on the north portion.
- Eight 55-gallon metal drums containing used oil were observed on the south central portion. Approximately 60-square feet of significant soil/unpaved staining was observed in the vicinity of the drums which represents a REC to the site.

_Sumps, cisterns, French drains, catch basins, and/or dry wells_

Three dry reservoirs were observed on site; one located on the southwestern portion, one located on the south central portion and one on the western portion. Staining and/or releases were not observed in the vicinity of the dry reservoirs and the dry reservoirs do not constitute a REC to the site.

Three cisterns were observed during the site reconnaissance. Staining and/or releases were not observed in the vicinity of the cisterns during the site reconnaissance and therefore do not constitute a REC to the site.

_Transformers and/or capacitors_

Ten pole-mounted transformers, owned and serviced by Southern California Edison (SCE), were observed during the site reconnaissance; however, information with regard to PCB content of the transformer fluids was not observed. Some transformers contain mineral oil which may contain PCBs. SCE maintains responsibility for the transformers, and if the transformers were "PCB contaminated," SCE is not required to replace the transformer fluids until a release is identified. However, evidence of current or prior release was not observed in the vicinity of the electrical equipment.

_Dumping or disposal areas_

A dumping area was observed within a dry reservoir during the site reconnaissance. The amount of debris was approximately five cubic yards and consists primarily of household waste items. Leakage, spills or other releases from these materials evidence of release were not observed and therefore, the dump does not constitute a REC to the site.

_Wells_

Three groundwater wells were observed on the site. The wells appear to have been installed for agricultural/irrigation purposes. During the site reconnaissance, oil releases from the pump equipment from a number of the wells was observed. However, the releases were limited to the concrete pads beneath the pumps. The staining appeared
de minimus in nature. Based on site observations, the groundwater wells do not constitute a REC to the site.

In order to address concerns identified in the Phase I Report, the following mitigation measure is required.

18. Prior to any construction-related permits being issued, the stained soil and waste oil drums shall be removed and disposed of in accordance with all existing rules and regulations. In the event that these areas and drums are part of the 10-acres that is not being developed, a letter shall be submitted by the property owner indicating such and that all use and storage of hazardous materials will be conducted in accordance with existing rules and regulations.

In addition to the survey of the project site, a database records search was conducted for the project site and the immediately surrounding properties by EDR. The project site and the properties within the required search distances were identified within these databases; however, it was determined that the individual lists do not present an environmental concern based upon regulatory status, apparent topographic gradient, and/or distance from the site. The following summarizes each of the listings.

8539 West Avenue H

This site is listed in the Historical Hazardous HHSS, HIST MANIFEST, LA HMS, and HAZNET regulatory databases. Based on a review of the HHSS listing, this facility is listed with one 1,000-gallon motor vehicle fuel UST. Based on a review of the LA HMS listing, this facility is listed with a UST file with the status of "equipment removed." Based on a review of the HIST MANIFEST and HAZNET listings, waste streams generated included waste oil and mixed oil in 1990. Based on a review of Case No. 011444-011483, one 1,000-gallon gasoline UST and one 550-gallon diesel UST were removed on June 21, 1990. Analytical results from two soil samples taken beneath the USTs were non-detect for BTEX and TPH and a closure certification was issued on February 20, 1991.

9023 West Avenue H

This site is listed in the Department of Toxic Substances Control - EnviroStor database (ENVIROSTOR), California State Water Resources Control Board - Historical Hazardous Substances Storage Information Database (HHSS), DTSC - Historical Hazardous Waste Manifest Data (HIST MANIFEST), LA HMS, Hazardous Waste Manifest Data (HAZNET) and School Property Evaluation Program Sites (SCH) regulatory databases. Based on a review of the HHSS listing, this facility is listed with a 4,000-gallon motor vehicle fuel UST, installed in 1955 and has since been removed. Based on a review of the HIST MANIFEST and HAZNET listings, waste streams generated at this facility included asbestos containing waste and household waste, between 1990 and 1998. The asbestos waste is likely associated with renovations of the school facility. Based on a review of the ENVIROSTOR and SCH listings, this facility is listed with a Cleanup case with the DTSC for Lead and the status is listed as "No Action Required as of July 3, 2001."
Potential contaminants were not found. Based on waste streams identified, removed UST equipment status, regulatory closed cleanup case with the DTSC and proposed gen-tie line location (over-head), the Del Sur School does not represent a REC to the site.

*Avenue H & 100th Street West*

This site is listed in the HAZNET and HIST MANIFEST regulatory database. Based on a review of the listings, waste streams generated at this facility included unspecified oil-containing waste, waste oil, mixed oil, and tank bottom waste between 1988 and 1990. Additional information was not provided. Based on the identified waste streams, proposed over-head gen-tie lines and the presumed depth of groundwater in the site vicinity, the listing does not represent a REC to the site.

*Avenue H & 90th Street West*

This site is listed in the HAZNET, ERNS, and CHMIRS regulatory databases. Based on a review of the HAZNET listings, waste streams included household waste and polychlorinated biphenyls and materials. Based on a review of the ERNS and CHMIRS listings, an equipment failure on July 1, 2002 resulted in a pole-mounted transformer falling and spilling 20-gallons of non-PCB transformer oil that affected soil only The remedial action is described as "material contained, clean up underway." Based on the identified waste streams and facility's topographic cross-gradient position relative to the site, this listing does not represent a REC to the site.

*46204 97th Street West*

The facility addressed at 46204 97th Street West is listed in the LA HMS regulatory database. Based on a review of the listing, this facility was permitted with a UST, which is listed as "equipment removed". Additional information was researched on-line at the LACPW-EPD database, and this address is listed with two files (File No. 015687-020097 and 015687-047234). The status of the UST file is listed as "removed file" and there is an open file with no permit exists. Based on the facility's cross-gradient position relative to the site, absence of regulatory LUST listing, presumed depth of groundwater in the site vicinity, line and removed status of the UST equipment, this listing does not represent a REC to the site.

*8202 West Avenue H*

This site is listed in the HAZNET and LA HMS regulatory databases. Information was not provided in the HAZNET listing. Based on a review of the LA HMS listing, this facility was equipped with a UST, which is listed with status as "equipment removed." Based on the facility's cross-gradient position relative to the site, absence of regulatory LUST listing, presumed depth of groundwater in the site vicinity and removed status of the UST equipment, these listings do not represent a REC to the site.
46701 90\textsuperscript{th} Street West

This site is listed in the Los Angeles County of Public Works Hazardous Materials System (LA HMS) database. Based on a review of the LA HMS listing, a "no permit exists" file was opened with File No. 21091. No additional information was available in the database. A file review at the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works on November 29, 2017 indicates the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works submitted a notice to file for USTs reported on the property. Based on correspondence, there are two 4,000-gallon USTs that were installed in the mid-1970s and have not been used since the late-1980s as the property owner died in 1988. Closure information was not available. Based on distance and depth to groundwater, the site does not constitute a REC to the site.

With implementation of the identified mitigation measure, impacts would be less than significant.

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

g. Access to the project site would be taken from Avenue G-8, 90\textsuperscript{th} Street West and 80\textsuperscript{th} Street West. 90\textsuperscript{th} Street West is a paved roadway and Avenue G-8 and 80\textsuperscript{th} Street West are both unpaved roadways. All access gates will be set back approximately 50 feet from the edge of the property line to allow vehicles to pull off of the roadway while the gate is opening and driveways off of paved roadways will be paved. 90\textsuperscript{th} Street West and Avenue H have both been designated as evacuation routes in the vicinity of the project site. However, the traffic generated by the proposed project is not sufficient to cause impacts at any of the area intersections. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact or physically block any identified evacuation routes and would not interfere with any adopted emergency response plan. No impacts are anticipated.

h. The property surrounding the project site is predominantly undeveloped with some single family residences immediately adjacent to and in the vicinity of the project site. Utility scale solar facilities are also located to the south and west of the project site. It is possible that the undeveloped lands could be subject to a grass fire. However, the project site is located within the boundaries of Fire Station 112, located at 8812 West Avenue E-8 and would also be served by Fire Station 130, located at 44558 40\textsuperscript{th} Street West, and Station 84, located at 5030 Avenue L-14, as needed. Therefore, impacts from wildland fires would be less than significant.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

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

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

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

c-c. Development of the proposed project would increase the amount of surface runoff as a result of impervious surfaces associated with some portions of the facilities (e.g., inverters, transformers, battery storage, etc.). The project site would be primarily developed with PV panels mounted on tracking systems on steel support structures. The only portions of the project site that would be graded would be for the roadways to ensure that they meet Fire Department standards and those portions of the site that would be paved in order to support structures. The remainder of the project site would be left in a pervious condition. Additionally, the proposed project would be designed to accept current flows entering the property and to handle any additional incremental runoff from the project sites. Therefore, impacts from drainage and runoff would be less than significant.

f. The proposed project does not involve the construction of any housing or occupied structures. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

g. The project site is designated as both Flood Zone X and Flood Zone X-Shaded per the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Panel No. 060672 (2008). Flood Zone X is outside
both the 100-year and 500-year flood zones and Flood Zone X-Shaded is located outside of the 100-year flood zone. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

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

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

a. The proposed project is not of the scale or nature that could physically divide an established community. The proposed project consists of the construction and operation of a 100 MW photovoltaic solar electric generating facility. The area surrounding the project site is predominantly vacant with some single family residences located immediately adjacent to the project site as described in the surrounding land uses section on pages 5 and 6. Additionally, other single family residences are scattered throughout the general vicinity of the project site and the community of Antelope Acres is located north of Avenue G. No new roadways would be constructed although 80th Street West and Avenue G would be graded to the site entrances in order to comply with Fire Department standards. The proposed project would not block a public street, trail or other access route or result in a physical barrier that would divide the community. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

b. The proposed project is consistent with the City’s General Plan and must be in conformance with the Lancaster Municipal Code. The proposed project will be in compliance with the City-adopted UBC (Item VI.a) and erosion-control requirements (Item VI.b). Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

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

a, b, d. The City’s General Plan (Table 3-1) establishes an outdoor maximum CNEL of 65 dBA for rural and residential uses. No noise measurements are available for the roadways immediately adjacent to the project site. The current noise levels for the roadways closest to the project site are as follows: Avenue H between 70th Street West and 60th Street West is approximately 50.4 dBA; Avenue G between 100th Street West and 90th Street West is approximately 43.4 dBA; and 70th Street West between Avenue G and Avenue H is 47.9 dBA (LMEA Table 8-11). The loudest phases of construction would involve earth moving equipment and vibratory pile driving. The total construction time for the project is estimated to be 10 to 14 months. The loudest phases of construction would occur over a portion of this period. Construction activities associated with earth-moving equipment and other construction machinery would temporarily increase noise levels for adjacent land uses. Noise levels would fluctuate depending upon construction activity, equipment type and duration of use, and the distance between noise source and receiver.

The closest noise sensitive receptors are the residences immediately adjacent to the project site and Del Sur Elementary School at the northwest corner of Avenue H and 90th Street West. Noise levels at these receptors may reach between 75 dBA and 85 dBA depending upon the location of the work and the type of equipment being utilized. These noise levels could cause interference with conversations or other normal daytime activities. However, with implementation of the mitigation measures identified below, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

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

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

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

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

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

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

25. All noise producing construction equipment and vehicles using internal combustion engines shall be equipped with mufflers, air-inlet silencers where appropriate, and any other shrouds, shields, or other noise-reducing features in good operating condition.
that meet or exceed original factory 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.

c. Operation of the proposed project would generate very minimal noise levels. The photovoltaic solar electric generating facilities would generate electricity with PV panels mounted on fixed or slow moving, silently rotating trackers. Previous noise readings were taken at the Western Antelope Blue Sky Ranch “A” project on March 9, 2015 to determine the noise levels associated with the inverters/transformers and tracking systems. At 20 feet from the noise source, the noise levels were 65.9 dBA.1 Based on this noise reading, the trackers/transformers/inverters would not be audible at the residences near the boundary of the project site. Additionally, a handful of employees would be necessary to run the proposed project with most of the work being done remotely. Periodic maintenance would primarily consist of cleaning of the PV panels, as necessary, and vegetation/landscaping maintenance. Because of the passive nature of the on-site operations, the likelihood of noise disturbance at the neighboring receptors is minimal. Therefore, noise impacts would be less than significant.

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

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

a. The proposed project consists of the construction and operation of a 100 MW photovoltaic solar electric generating facility which would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth. The construction of the proposed projects is anticipated to employ approximately a total of 250 individuals, most of who would come from the local area. Operation of the proposed project would occur remotely with occasional maintenance needs being conducted by a handful of people. These facilities would help achieve State mandates which require 33% of electricity to be derived from renewable sources by 2020 and 50% by 2030. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

b-c. A portion of the project site is currently developed as a winery and alfalfa farm and contains residential structures along Avenue H. The ten acres that the buildings are located on will not be developed and the structures will remain. Other structures on the project site are unoccupied and not likely habitable. No housing or people would be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

The proposed project would increase the need for fire and police services; however, the project site is within the current service area of both these agencies and the additional time and cost to service the site is minimal. The proposed project would not induce

---

1 Final Environmental Impact Report for the Antelope North Solar Project, SCH #2017061079, Conditional Use Permit (No. 17-10), Aspen Environmental Group, January 2018.
substantial population growth and therefore, would not substantially increase the demand on parks, schools, or other public facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

XV. RECREATION

a-b. The proposed project involves the construction and operation of a 100 MW photovoltaic solar generating facility. As discussed in Item XIV.a, it is anticipated that a maximum of 250 construction workers would be present on the project site at one time. These workers are expected to come from the local area and would not create an additional demand on recreational facilities. Once the proposed project is operational, most of the operations would be handled remotely and would not generate employees who would potentially be utilizing recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts to recreational facilities would occur and no construction of new facilities would be necessary.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

a. The proposed project would generate construction traffic in the form of worker vehicles and delivery trucks. These trips would only occur during construction and would most likely occur at off-peak hours of the day. Adequate access to the project site exists from Avenue G, Avenue G-8, Avenue H, 90th Street West and 80th Street West to handle the trips that construction would generate. Most of the activities associated with operation of the proposed project would be handled remotely. Occasional maintenance activities would be required and it is anticipated that at most approximately 1-2 trips per week would occur. This number of trips would not impact the surrounding street system. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

c. The project site does not contain any aviation related uses and the proposed project would not include the development of any aviation related uses. The proposed project is a photovoltaic solar electric generating facility and the panels are designed to absorb light, not reflect it. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere with small aircraft flying overhead and would not have an impact on air traffic patterns.

d. No roadway improvements are required as part of the proposed project. Any driveways that take access from a paved roadway would be required to be paved. No hazardous conditions would be created and no impacts would occur.

e. The proposed project would have adequate emergency access from 90th Street West, 80th Street West, and Avenue G-8. Interior circulation would be provided in accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles County Fire Department; therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

a-b. No tribal cultural resources have been identified either through the sacred lands file search conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission or by any of the Native American Tribes with cultural affiliations to the area. Mitigation measures have been identified under the Cultural Resources Section which outline the process to be followed in the event that unknown resources are encountered during construction and require the developer to come to an agreement with two tribes over any issues that they may have with the project. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

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

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

d. The proposed project has minimal needs for water as there will be no employees routinely on the project site and no structures which would be occupied by individuals are proposed. The only water needs the proposed project has would be for the occasional washing of the solar panels and for maintenance of the landscaping until it is established. It is estimated that the operation of the proposed project would require no more than 4.8-acre feet of water per year. This water will either come from existing water wells (on- and off-site) that the applicant has rights to or will be trucked into the project site. If the water is trucked to the project site, the most likely source will be recycled water. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e. See Section Item XVIII.b.

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

a-c. Other solar projects have been approved, constructed or are currently under construction in the City of Lancaster and in the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. This has resulted in a large number of acres being converted to solar generating facilities. Most of the impacts generated by these projects are site specific and generally do not influence the impacts on another site. Additionally, all projects undergo environmental and have required mitigation measures to reduce impacts when warranted. Three solar projects are currently under construction to the west of the project site with construction anticipated to be concluded this year. One other solar project at the southwest corner of Avenue H and 70th Street West is currently going through the entitlement process.

Cumulative impacts are the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of a project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. The proposed project would not create any impacts with respect to agricultural/forestry resources, land use planning, mineral resources, recreation, and tribal cultural resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to a cumulative impact for these resources.

Construction of solar projects throughout the Antelope Valley would lead to a cumulative loss of habitat for a variety of plants and animals. The project site contains suitable habitat for burrowing owls, foraging habitat for Swainson’s hawk, and habitat for nesting birds, lizards, badgers and kit foxes. Mitigation measures have been identified to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. Additionally, linear drainage features were identified along the proposed gen-tie route. However, it is likely that impacts to these features can be avoided, depending upon placement of the utility poles or through the type of construction utilized to run the line. Therefore, no cumulative impact to drainages would occur. As such, the proposed project’s contribution to cumulative impacts with respect to biological resources would not be cumulatively considerable. Additionally, the City requires the payment of a biological impact fee to address the cumulative loss of biological resources within the Antelope Valley. This fee is put in to a separate account which is utilized to acquire conservation habitat.

Mitigation measures are required to reduce dust and noise impacts to the nearby sensitive receptors. The other solar developments in the area that are currently under construction are anticipated to be operation prior to the proposed start of construction for this project and as such impacts such as dust and noise would not combine to create cumulative impacts. Mitigation measures associated with cultural resources are statements of regulatory requirements and a requirement for the developer to work with tribes to address any issues they may have. These impacts and mitigation measures are site specific and would not combine to create a cumulative impact. All other mitigation measures that were identified are a statement of regulatory requirements. Therefore, any potential cumulative impacts are less than significant and would not be cumulatively considerable.
List of Referenced Documents and Available Locations*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIR:</th>
<th>Technical Memorandum Regarding San Pablo A Solar Project – Air Quality Impact Assessment, SWCA Environmental Consultants, May 24, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRR1:</td>
<td>Biological Resources Technical Report for the San Pablo A Solar Project, Los Angeles County, California, SWCA Environmental Consultants, February 2, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRR2:</td>
<td>Existing Conditions Jurisdictional Delineation Report for the San Pablo A Solar Project, Los Angeles County, California, SWCA Environmental Consultants, February 2, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS:</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Assessment, San Pablo A Solar Project, Area, City of Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California, BRC Consulting, LLC, February 2, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA:</td>
<td>Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, San Pablo A Solar, Northeast of West Avenue H and 90th Street West, Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California, Terracon Consultants, Inc., February 2, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPEIR:</td>
<td>Lancaster General Plan Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGP:</td>
<td>Lancaster General Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMC:</td>
<td>Lancaster Municipal Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMEA:</td>
<td>Lancaster Master Environmental Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSHZ:</td>
<td>State Seismic Hazard Zone Maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS:</td>
<td>United States Geological Survey Maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA SCS:</td>
<td>United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Maps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* DSD: Development Services Department  
Lancaster City Hall  
44933 Fern Avenue  
Lancaster, California 93534