7.0 Appendix – CEQA Findings

CEQA Findings for Projects 1 – 6 are provided on the following pages.

This page intentionally left blank.

FINDINGS OF FACT REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

FOR THE SILVERADO POWER WEST LOS ANGELES COUNTY PROJECT

PROJECT SITE NO. 1 (North Lancaster Ranch)

COUNTY PROJECT NO. R2011-00833-(5)

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 20110079

ZONE CHANGE NO. 201100005

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 201100109

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2012061068

PROJECT FINDINGS ORGANIZATION

Section 1	Introduction
Section 2	Findings Regarding Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Have Been Mitigated to a Less than Significant Level
Section 3	Findings Regarding Cumulative Environmental Effects Which are Not Significant or Which Have Been Mitigated to a Less Than Significant Level
Section 4	Findings Regarding Project Alternatives
Section 5	Findings Regarding the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Section 6	CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 and 15092 Findings
Section 7	CEQA Guidelines Section 15084(D)(3) and 15084(D)(4) Findings
Section 8	Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(C) Findings
Section 9	Nature of Findings
Section 10	Reliance on Record
Section 11	Relationship of Findings to EIR
Section 12	Custodian of Records
Exhibit A	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP")

SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The County of Los Angeles ("County") Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") hereby certifies and finds that the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County ("Project") Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR"), State Clearinghouse Number 2012061068, has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq., "CEQA") and the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Cal. Code Regs. Sections 15000 et seq., "CEQA Guidelines").

The Project Final EIR consists of the following documents: (1) December 2013 Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR" or "DEIR"); (2) December 2013 Technical Appendices to the Draft EIR; and (3) March 2014 Final EIR.

The Commission hereby further certifies that it received, reviewed and considered the information contained in the following: (i) the Final EIR; (ii) the applications for Zone Change No. 201100005 and Conditional Use Permit No. 20110079; and (iii) all hearings, and submissions of testimony from County officials and departments, the Applicant (as defined herein), the public, other public agencies, community groups, and organizations.

Concurrently with the adoption of these findings, the Commission adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP"), attached hereto as Exhibit A. Having received, reviewed and considered the foregoing information, as well as any and all information in the administrative record and the record of proceedings, the Commission hereby makes the following Findings of Fact ("Findings") pursuant to and in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15090:

SECTION 1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

1.1.1 Project Location.

The Project site is located in the northern portion of unincorporated Los Angeles County. The EIR analyzed a total of six (6) individual Project sites (collectively, "Projects" or "Projects 1-6"), which will each be subject to separate review and approval by the County.[1]

These Findings specifically pertain to "Project 1", which is approximately 240 acres and located at 110th Street West and West Avenue B, in Lancaster, California (also referred to as "North Lancaster Ranch"). The Assessor's Parcel Numbers ("APNs") for Project 1 are 3262-001-006 and 3262-001-005. When complete, Project 1 would produce 20 megawatts ("MW") of electricity from solar photovoltaic modules.

[1] The six individual Projects are not dependent upon each other for success. Each Project can succeed as a stand-alone project if other projects are not approved by Los Angeles County or if technical or financial problems delay or block the completion of a Project. CEQA allows for a group of projects to be analyzed as a single EIR; each Project must also receive approval of its CUP application and other entitlements on the merits of the individual Project and individual site.

1.1.2 Project Description—Features Common to Projects 1 - 6.

There are certain general Project characteristics and features that will apply to each of the individual six Project sites, including Project 1, as follows:

All six of the Projects would be designed and built using the same or similar methods and would have similar Project characteristics. The Projects would utilize photovoltaic ("PV") technology on fixed-tilt or tracker mounting supports. The proposed PV Projects would be constructed in phases and operated for an estimated 35 years. Construction would generally take place during normal daylight hours and would conform to County construction requirements.

Each Project would consist of the following elements:

- PV modules;
- PV module mounting system;
- Balance of system and electrical boxes (e.g., combiner boxes, electrical disconnects);
- Substation (Projects 1 – 5);
- Electrical inverters and transformers;
- Electrical AC collection system, including switchgear;
- Data monitoring equipment;
- Generation tie line; and
- Access roads and chain link perimeter security fencing.

<u>Solar PV Generating Facilities</u>

The Solar Generating Facilities ("SGFs") are designed for optimum performance and ease of maintenance. The Projects would consist of a series of PV module arrays mounted on racking systems, which are typically supported by a pile-driven foundation design. The foundation design would be determined based on the full geotechnical survey. The module mounting system, or racking system, would have a fixed-tilt or tracker PV array configuration and would be oriented south to maximize the amount of incident solar radiation absorbed over the course of the year. Electricity from a series of PV arrays would be funneled and combined at combiner boxes located throughout the SGF. The electrical current would then be further collected and combined prior to feeding the inverters. The SGF would be laid out in a PV block design to allow adequate area for maintenance in the way of clearances or access roads.

Inverters would be consolidated in areas to minimize cable routing and trenching and ensure minimal electrical losses. The alternating current ("AC") from the inverters would be routed through an AC collection system and consolidated within system switchgear. The final output from the SGF would be processed through a transformer to match the interconnection voltage. Electrical safety and protection systems would be provided to meet utility, International Organization for Standardization, and regulatory codes and standards. The energy would be

delivered to the regional electrical distribution network. A security perimeter fence with appropriate signage for public protection would be installed. Points of ingress/egress would be accessed by locked gates for facility services and maintenance.

Photovoltaic Modules

The SGFs would require installation of PV modules. The total number of PV modules required would depend on the technology selected, optimization evaluation, and detailed design. The market conditions, economic considerations, and the environmental factors would be taken into account during the detail design process. The following PV module technologies or equivalent are being considered for incorporation into the Projects:

- PV thin-film technology
- PV crystalline silicon technology
- Fixed-tilt configuration; and
- Tracking design configuration.

The modules configured with a fixed tilt would be oriented toward the south and angled at a degree that would optimize solar resource efficiency. For the tracking configuration, the modules would rotate from east to west over the course of the day. Modules would be non-reflective and highly absorptive.

Standard Installation, Array Assembly, and Racking

The final racking system would be determined by optimization evaluations and economic assessments and incorporated into the detailed design. Likewise, the final foundation design would be determined based on the geotechnical survey for each of the PV Project locations. Once the foundation has been installed, the module mounting system would be installed on it. For a tracking configuration, motors would be installed to drive the tracking mechanism. The PV modules would be delivered to each site during construction to support the installation schedule. The module mounting system would be oriented in rows within a PV design block, presenting a standard and uniform appearance across the facility. The panel configuration would be uniform in height and width.

Collection, Inverters, AC Collection, and Transformers

Modules would be electrically connected into strings. Each string would be funneled by electrical conduit (typically underground) wiring to combiner boxes located throughout the solar field power blocks. The output power cables from the combiner boxes would be again consolidated and feed the direct current ("DC") electricity to inverters, which convert the DC to AC. Underground electrical cables would be installed using ordinary trenching techniques, which include excavation of trenches to accommodate conduits. Wire depth and trench backfill would be in accordance with local, state, and federal codes.

The AC energy would be stepped up to the appropriate interconnection voltage by system transformers to match the voltage at the grid interconnection. As required, switchgear cabinetry

would be provided where necessary for circuit control. All electrical inverters, transformers, and gear would be placed on concrete foundation structures.

Commissioning of equipment would include testing, calibration of equipment, and troubleshooting. All electrical equipment, inverters, collector system, and PV array systems would be tested prior to commencement of commercial operations.

Substations

For Projects 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, which require substations, the area for the substations would be appropriately graded and excavated to accommodate transformer equipment, the control building foundation, and oil containment area. Foundations for equipment within each approximately 1-acre substation would be constructed with reinforced concrete.

Structural components in the Project substation area would include:

- Transformers, switchgear, and safety systems; and
- Footings and oil containment system for transformers.

Interconnection Descriptions

Each inverter would be fully enclosed and pad mounted and would be approximately 90 inches in height. The AC output of two inverters would be fed via underground cable into the low-voltage side of the inverter step-up transformer, generally within 20 feet of the inverters. Each transformer would be mounted on a concrete pad and enclosed together with switchgear and a junction box. Transformers are typically 87 inches in height. The high-voltage output of the transformer would be combined in series via underground collector cables to the junction box of the nearest transformer, ranging from as little as 60 feet to as much as 700 feet. The collector system cables would be tied throughout the SGF at underground junction boxes to the main underground collector cables, which would be composed of a larger wire gauge, to the location of the generator step-up transformer ("GSU"), as applicable at each Project location. The main collector cables would rise into the low-voltage busbar and protection equipment that would be enclosed together with the GSU. The primary switchgear includes the main circuit breaker and utility metering equipment, and it would be enclosed separately but pad-mounted together with the GSU. Both the GSU and the primary switchgear would stand approximately 87 inches in height.

The output of the switchgear would be the start of the Project generation tie ("gen-tie") line. The connections from the SGFs to the regional transmission lines are made through the construction of gen-tie lines. Los Angeles County requires that all gen-tie lines be underground except when other applicable regulations require otherwise, and Projects 1 − 6 are each designed in this manner. Each gen-tie line would consist of three phases of either underground or overhead conductor and a disconnect switch. The overhead conductor would be mounted on either wooden or tubular steel poles of varying heights ranging from 55 to 85 feet. Pole height would be determined by the span between poles as defined in the final design for each Project.

Data Collection Systems

Each Project would be designed with a comprehensive Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition ("SCADA") system for remote monitoring of facility operation and/or remote control of critical components. Within the site, the fiber optic or other cabling required for the monitoring system, would be installed with the gathering line system throughout the solar field leading to a centrally located (or series of appropriately located) SCADA system cabinets. The external telecommunications connections to the SCADA system cabinets may be through either wireless or hard-wired telecommunications to a centralized data collection center.

The system would also include a permanent meteorological data collection system. The station would have several weather sensors: a pyranometer for measuring solar irradiance, a thermometer to measure air temperature, a barometric pressure sensor, and two wind sensors to measure speed and direction. These sensors would be connected to a data logger, which would compile the data for transmission to the data collection center.

Construction

Construction for each of the six Project facilities consists of three major phases: (1) site preparation, (2) PV system installation testing and startup, and (3) site cleanup/restoration. Best Management Practices ("BMPs") would be required during all construction phases of the Projects. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP") incorporating BMPs for erosion control would be prepared and approved before the start of construction. The Projects would also comply with applicable post-construction water quality standards adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board ("RWQCB").

PV System Installation

PV system installation includes earthwork, grading, and erosion control, as well as construction of the plant substation and erection of the PV modules, supports, and associated electrical equipment. System installation would begin with teams installing the steel/concrete piers support structures. The exact design would be finalized pending evaluation of soil conditions.

The proposed method of installation would be the use of vibration-driven pile foundations. This step would be followed by panel installation and electrical work. A very limited volume of concrete would be required for the substation footings, foundations, pads for the transformers, and other substation equipment. Silverado Power, LLC ("Applicant") does not propose to use excavated and poured footings or foundations for the PV arrays. Concrete would be produced at an off-site location by a local provider and transported to the Project sites by truck.

The enclosures housing the inverters have a pre-cast concrete base. Final concrete specifications would be determined during detailed design engineering consistent with applicable building codes. The primary site preparation method for the PV modules would be mowing, because the majority of the six sites are very flat with little change in topography. However, there may be a few instances where limited earthwork, including ponding area leveling of less than one foot in depth, and erosion control cultivation may be required to accommodate the placement of PV arrays. Other than required grading for roads, pads, and drainage features, and standard

trenching and installation work, no other earthwork would be performed within the array areas. Erosion control techniques used during construction may include the use of silt fencing, straw bales, temporary catch basins, inlet filters, and truck tire muck shakers. Construction of the PV arrays includes the installation of support beams, module rail assemblies, PV modules, inverters, transformers, and buried electrical cables.

Wastes generated during construction may include the following: cardboard, wood pallets, copper wire, scrap steel, common trash, and wood wire spools. The Applicant does not expect to generate hazardous waste during construction. However, field equipment used during construction would contain various hazardous materials such as hydraulic oil, diesel fuel, grease, lubricants, solvents, adhesives, paints, and other petroleum-based products contained in construction vehicles.

Operations & Maintenance

Upon commissioning, the Projects would enter the operational phase. For the duration of the operational phase, the Projects would be operated and monitored remotely by a third party contractor, with an assumed two on-site visits for security, maintenance, and system monitoring per quarter (total of eight trips per year) by two third party employees in one light duty truck, and two on-site visits by four third party employees for biannual panel washing that includes one light duty truck and one water truck. Therefore the trips would be no more than 10 trips annually for security, maintenance, system monitoring and panel washing. There would be no personnel stationed on-site full time during operations. The PV arrays would produce electricity passively with minimal moving parts; therefore, maintenance requirements would be limited. Any required planned maintenance would be scheduled to avoid peak-load periods, and unplanned maintenance would typically be responded to as needed depending on the event.

Security

To ensure the safety of the public and the facilities, the sites would be fenced and signs would be posted. Security measures would be installed as necessary to mitigate and/or deter unauthorized access. Access to the sites would be controlled and gates would be installed at the roads entering the property.

Decommissioning Plan

A Decommissioning Plan for each of the Projects would be prepared and submitted for approval to Los Angeles County prior to obtaining a grading permit. The plan would assure that the land is protected during operations and returned as closely as possible to its original state upon termination of the use of the land as a SGF. It is unknown at this time if solar energy electricity production would continue to be utilized on this land in excess of 35 years, and thus the future long-term use of the site beyond 35 years is unknown. The life of each facility is presently proposed to be 35 years. The Decommissioning Plan would be implemented in the early summer of the year or year following the time of facility closure thus allowing the site reclamation to be completed outside of the rainy season and before winter begins. In the event that a Project ceases

operations prior to completion of the 35-year estimated life of the Project, applicable provisions of the Decommissioning Plan would commence.

Section 1.1.3 Project Description—Features Unique to Project Site 1

Project 1 (North Lancaster Ranch) would have a generating capacity of 20 MW-AC and would be located on approximately 240 acres of primarily unproductive agricultural land in Los Angeles County. The facility would operate year-round, producing electric power during daytime hours. The power generated by Project 1 would be connected to the existing Southern California Edison ("SCE") 66 kilovolt ("kV") transmission line with the voltage transformation equipment and system safety equipment constructed on the site. For Phases 1 and 2 of Project 1, electricity would be delivered to the existing SCE 66 kV transmission line running north-south along the west side of 110th Street West.

Phase 1 of Project 1 would interconnect via an undergrounded 0.02 mile gen-tie line across 110th Street West originating at the DC collection system within the Project 1 site. Phase 2 of Project 1 would interconnect via an undergrounded 0.54-mile gen-tie line originating at the DC collection system within the Project site.

From the southwest corner of APN 3262-001-006, the gen-tie route would be as follows: 0.02 miles underground across West Avenue B, 0.5 miles underground in the public right-of-way ("ROW") along the south side of West Avenue B, and 0.02 miles underground across 110th Street West. Alternatively, the gen-tie may be placed 0.5 miles underground in the public ROW along the north side of West Avenue B, and 0.02 miles underground across 110th Street West.

Project 1 Telecommunications Lines

The primary telecommunication method is expected to be direct fiber optic cables placed overhead or underground along the path of the gen-tie line within the public ROW or located on private land from the Project 1 site to existing or proposed telecommunication infrastructure. A dedicated broadband connection from a local provider will be secured at the site.

Project 1 Construction

Project 1 would be constructed in two phases. The proposed schedule for Phase 1 is to begin site preparation and construction in the third quarter of 2014 and complete construction within approximately six months. The proposed schedule for Phase 2 is to begin site preparation, including any necessary demolition, and construction in the first quarter of 2015, and complete construction within approximately six months, being commercially operational by the end of the second quarter of 2015. Construction will begin with initial mowing and fine grading for the substation area. The substation area will initially be utilized as the Project staging areas. The staging areas typically include construction offices, a first aid station and other temporary buildings, worker parking, truck loading and unloading facilities, and an area for system assembly.

Subsequent areas to be graded would include internal Project roads and equipment pad locations. The grading acreage for Project 1 (inclusive of staging areas, roads and equipment pad locations) would be 20.5 acres.

The expected construction water use for the Project 1 site would be a maximum of 50 acre feet of water in 2014 and 50 acre feet of water in 2015, from outside of the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin ("Basin") or other authorized water that would be obtained from an off-site provider. Depending upon climatic conditions during construction, the estimated water use could be much lower. Construction water needs would be limited to soil conditioning and dust suppression. Potable water would be brought in to the Project 1 site for drinking and domestic needs.

Construction of the site, beginning with site preparation through equipment setup and commencement of commercial operation, is expected to last approximately six months for each phase. The on-site workforce would consist of laborers, electricians, supervisory personnel, support personnel, and construction management personnel. Construction would generally occur during daylight hours, Monday through Friday. Construction activities would be conducted consistent with Los Angeles County regulations regarding hours of construction. Project 1 is expected to create 100 new jobs at peak crew size during the construction phase.

Project 1 Operations

No personnel would be stationed at the Project 1 facility, and no occupied structures would be built on the site. Full and part-time positions over the life of Project 1 would be required for periodic operation and maintenance activities and would be performed by a third party contractor. The operations water requirements would be 2.9 acre feet per year ("AFY").

Section 1.1.4 Discretionary Actions Required for Project 1

Implementation of Project 1 will require discretionary approval actions by the County, including:

- **Conditional Use Permit ("CUP")**: To authorize the construction and operation of a solar photovoltaic electricity generating plant on 240 acres and installation of a water tank in the A-2 Zone. Project 1 meets the definition of "electric generating plant" in the Los Angeles County Zoning Code. Pursuant to Section 22.24.150, electric generating plants are a use subject to a conditional use permit in the A-2 Zone.

- **Zone Change**: To authorize a Zone Change from the A-1-2 (Light Agricultural) zone, to A-2 (Heavy Agricultural) zone.

Section 1.1.5 Statement of Project Objectives

Together, proposed Projects 1 – 6 would meet the existing and future demand for electricity generated from clean, renewable technology by generating 172 MW of electrical energy from the sun. Recent legislation enacted in California recognizes the multiple benefits associated with the development of renewable energy resources. These benefits include a reduced reliance on fossil fuel, diversification of energy portfolios, reductions in greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions, and the creation of "green" jobs within the state of California. Additionally, the Projects would assist

California in meeting the newly established Renewable Energy Portfolio Standards ("RPS"). Senate Bill 14 established RPS targets for California, stating: "All retail sellers of electricity shall serve 33 percent of their load with renewable energy by 2020." State government agencies have been directed to take all appropriate actions to implement this target in all regulatory proceedings, including siting, permitting, and procurement for renewable energy power plants and transmission lines.

Each of the six proposed PV Project sites, including Project 1, qualify as eligible renewable energy resources as defined by the California Public Resources Code, and would help the State meet the objective of increasing renewable energy generation. In addition, Projects 1-6 would contribute much-needed competitive energy during peak power periods to the electrical grid in California.

As another key objective, Projects 1-6 have each been sited to minimize impacts to the environment and the local community as follows:

- Using disturbed land or land that has been previously degraded from prior use;
- Using existing electrical distribution facilities, rights-of-way, roads, and other existing infrastructure where feasible to minimize the need for new electrical support facilities; and
- Minimizing impacts to threatened or endangered species or their habitats, wetlands and waters of the United States, cultural resources, and sensitive land uses.

SECTION 1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT PROCESS

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, the County completed an Initial Study (June 13, 2012) for the proposed Project, and determined that an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") was required. A Notice of Preparation ("NOP"), including the Initial Study was circulated to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, responsible, trustee, and interested agencies, and key interest groups beginning June 20, 2012 to solicit comments on the proposed content of the Draft EIR. The NOP was circulated for the required 30-day comment period which ended July 20, 2012. A Scoping Meeting was held on July 14, 2012 at the Lancaster Library located at 601 West Lancaster Boulevard in Lancaster, California, to facilitate public review and comment on the Project.

The Draft EIR includes the Initial Study, the comment letters received during the public review period in response to the NOP, and a transcript of verbal comments received during the Scoping Meeting (see Draft EIR Appendix A-1 to A-5). All NOP comments relating to the EIR were reviewed and the issues raised in those comments were addressed, to the extent feasible, in the Draft EIR.

Potentially significant environmental impacts addressed in the Draft EIR include Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, Hazards and Hazardous

Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Public Services, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. The Draft EIR analyzed both Project-level and cumulative effects of the Project on these topics and identified a variety of mitigation measures to minimize, reduce, avoid, or compensate for the potential adverse effects of the proposed Project.

The Draft EIR also analyzed five potential alternatives to the proposed Project, including: 1) No Project Alternative; 2) Lower Intensity Projects; 3) Select Other Project Sites; 4) Rooftop Solar Generation; and 5) Wind Energy Generation. Potential environmental impacts of each of these alternatives were discussed at the CEQA-prescribed level of detail and comparisons were made to the proposed Project.

The Initial Study determined that the Project would result in less than significant or no impact to several environmental resource areas:

1) **Mineral Resources**: The Project would not have the potential to result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region, including those identified in a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

2) **Employment, Population & Housing**: The Project would provide significant short-term employment for construction workers during the two year construction period. The duration of construction for the Projects would be less than two years; and construction personnel would commute to the Projects from Lancaster, the Los Angeles areas, and Kern County. However, jobs would be temporary and would be for the two year construction period. Construction workers would not establish new households and are not anticipated to permanently relocate to the area. Additionally, adequate construction personnel presently living in Los Angeles and Kern County would fill all of the jobs that will be available. Area population, housing demands and the need for educational facilities and libraries would not be affected significantly because jobs that would be created are short term in nature; therefore, they would not be impacted by the Projects. Employment, Population, and Housing would not be impacted because the Projects do not require a significant number of personnel to operate them once they are built and producing electricity, and they do not have growth inducing impacts to the local community. Requirements for operations and maintenance are not significant and would be conducted by a few specialized contracted third-party personnel who will cover the Projects. There is no operations and maintenance building on any of the Projects 1-6.

3) **Recreation**: The Project would have no impact on recreation opportunities in the area. There are adequate recreation opportunities in the area, and the availability of these would not change as a result of the Project.

Following the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("LACDRP") internal departmental review and analysis of the proposed Project through the screencheck process, the Draft EIR was submitted to the State Clearinghouse, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, and circulated for public review period beginning January 6, 2014. The 45-day public review period required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15087 ended on February 19, 2014.

A public hearing was held before the County's Hearing Examiner to take public testimony on the Draft EIR, at Lancaster Library located at 601 West Lancaster Boulevard in Lancaster, California, held at 1:00 p.m. on February 1, 2014. Approximately 80 people attended the Hearing Examiner meeting, and 26 attendees provided oral comments on the Draft EIR. A transcript of the oral comments made at the Hearing Examiner Meeting is contained in Section 2.0 of the Final EIR.

SECTION 1.3 PROJECT FINDINGS INTRODUCTION

The Findings made by the County, pursuant to Section 21081 of CEQA, and Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, on the consideration of Project 1 of the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project in unincorporated Los Angeles County, California are presented below. All potentially significant impacts of the Project identified in the Final EIR are included herein, and are organized according to the resources affected.

The Findings in this document are for Project 1 of the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project, and are supported by information and analysis from the Final EIR and other evidence in the administrative record.

For each significant impact, a Finding has been made as to one or more of the following, in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091:

A. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects on the environment.

B. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.

A narrative of supporting facts follows the appropriate Finding. For all of the impacts, one or more of the findings above have been made. The proposed Project will not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts.

SECTION 2.0 FINDINGS REGARDING POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH ARE NOT SIGNIFICANT OR WHICH HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

All Final EIR mitigation measures, as set forth in the MMRP (attached as Exhibit A to these findings) have been incorporated by reference into the conditions of approval for Project 1. These mitigation measures and conditions of approval will result in a substantial mitigation of the effects of Project 1, such that the effects are not significant or have been mitigated to a level of less than significant. Specifically, the Commission has determined, based on the Final EIR, that Project 1 design features, mitigation measures, and conditions of approval will reduce

Project impacts concerning Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Public Services, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems to a level of less than significant.

2.1 AESTHETICS

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have significant visual impacts to the Project area if it had a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; would be visible from, or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail; substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features; or create a new source of substantial light or glare which will adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Aesthetics.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are no designated scenic highways in the vicinity of the Project 1 site. It is highly unlikely that the Project 1 site would be visible from the Foothills Area or Quartz Hill, which are both located over 9 miles from the site. Even though these areas are at higher elevations, from this distance the proposed Project 1 site would fade into the flat landscape. **(DEIR at 4.1-3)**. The proposed SGFs would be not located along or in proximity to a state scenic highway and would not substantially damage or impact scenic resources such as trees (including Joshua trees) or rock outcroppings. There are no historic buildings located within the Project 1 site. **(DEIR at 4.1-105)**.

The proposed Project 1 site is currently a fallow agricultural field, and is typical of the surrounding landscape. The visual quality of the Project 1 site is low. The site itself does not have unique or rare features, or hold special significance. The topography is uniform and flat. Vegetation is uniform and consists of grasses and short shrubs. No permanent water features occur on the site, and there are no features or characteristics that set the site apart from the surrounding landscape. **(DEIR at 4.1-105)**.

No trails are located on the Project Site 1. Therefore construction or operation of the SGF and gen-tie line would not cause the vacation of any portion of any trail, nor would it obstruct expansive views from any trails. The Project Site 1 may be visible from elevated locations along the Pacific Crest Trail, from certain locations in the California Poppy Reserve, and would be visible from portions of the Little Buttes area. The nearest trails identified are associated with Little Buttes, approximately 0.7 miles southeast of the site. The SGF would be visible from trails

in the Little Buttes area when not screened or partially screened by topography. The California Poppy Reserve is located approximately 4.7 miles southwest of the site and approximately 8.5 miles from the Pacific Crest Trail. Even if visible, Project site 1 would be barely discernible from the Poppy Reserve and the Pacific Crest Trail due to distance, and largely fade into the flat landscape. If it is discernible, it would appear as a rectangular form similar to an agricultural field in shape and size. The Little Buttes Trail, an adopted proposed multiple-use County trail, runs parallel to the Project site along West Avenue B. The Project site would be dominant in views when trail users are located adjacent to the site. There are no County-designated bikeways within 4 miles of the Project site. **(DEIR at 4.1-3; 4.1-78; 4.1-100)**

90th Street West, located approximately 1.3 miles east of Project Site 1, is considered a potential scenic route by the City of Lancaster's Master Environmental Assessment (City of Lancaster 2009a). 90th Street West is located at a slightly lower elevation than the proposed SGF. As shown in DEIR Figure 4.1-6, the landscape between 90th Street West north of West Avenue B and the site is very flat. South of 90th Street west, the proposed Project 1 site would be screened by terrain associated with the Little Buttes area. Because of the low profile of the solar modules and the level to lower elevation of 90th Street West compared to the site, where visible the SGF would likely fade into the flat landscape and not dominate the view. **(DEIR at 4.1-4)**. The proposed Project 1 gen-tie lines would be undergrounded from the proposed Project 1 site, under the adjacent road, to a riser next to an existing pole. **(DEIR at 4.1-78)**.

Construction activities and equipment on Project 1 site would be noticeable from vistas on top of and around Little Buttes because of the close proximity of the SGF. During construction of the SGF, disturbance areas would appear as large patches of fine, buff-colored rock and soil. Construction activities may produce dust visible from Little Buttes and 90th Street West, but impacts would be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of the fugitive dust plan (Mitigation Measure A-1). Any trash, debris, and waste would be removed from the Project 1 site during construction and the site screened or partially screened by fencing. Adverse visual effects from construction would be temporary and last only during the construction time period, and would be less than significant with Mitigation Measures A-1, A-2 and A-3. **(DEIR at 4.1-93; 4.1-100; 4.1-105)**. Because construction activities would be limited to daylight hours, impacts from nighttime lighting would not occur. Lighting will comply with the Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Therefore, the impacts would be less than significant with implementation of MM A-5. **(DEIR at 4.1-113)**.

A post-construction visual simulation (DEIR Figure 4.1-31) was developed from a viewpoint on top of Little Buttes at approximately 0.7 mile southeast and 100 feet higher in elevation than the southeast corner of the Project 1 site. The overall contrast introduced to the landscape at this viewpoint was evaluated to be moderate, and no changes are anticipated to landforms. The visual effects of vegetation removal would be screened or mostly screened by the solar modules, and this change would not be visible from this perspective. The installation of the solar modules would create a weak contrast in terms of form, and a moderate contrast in terms of line, color, and texture. **(DEIR at 4.1-93)**.

In addition, other electric infrastructure, including the high-voltage transmission lines and a large wind farm, are also visible from the Project 1 site. Because this existing electrical infrastructure is also visible from scenic vistas from the Pacific Crest Trail and Little Buttes, and other PV

solar fields may be visible from the same scenic vistas (Antelope Valley Solar Phase I) the SGF would not significantly degrade views from nearby scenic vistas. Even where visible, the Project 1 site would not be a dominant element in the landscape unless the viewer is situated directly adjacent to the facility. At eight feet tall, the PV modules are relatively short, and given their design, which is to absorb sunlight instead of reflecting it, the modules would not be highly reflective. **(DEIR at 4.1-94)**.

Viewers such as nearby residents and travelers on local roads would still experience views of the open desert lands around the Project 1 site after the solar facility is constructed. Even where visible, the proposed SGF components would not be a dominant element in the landscape unless the viewer was directly adjacent to the facility. A contrast rating was conducted from the viewpoint shown in DEIR Figure 4.1-38 (approximately 0.25 miles east of the site) to assess the level of contrast that would be introduced by the proposed Project to landform, vegetation, or structures in terms of major landform characteristics (form, line, color, and texture). The height, bulk, pattern, and scale of the proposed Project 1 features are considerations in the contrast rating process. **(DEIR at 4.1-112).**

According to the contrast rating (provided in DEIR Appendix B-1.6), the SGF can be expected to introduce a low level of contrast to the landscape from this viewpoint. No changes to landforms or vegetation would be visible. The SGF would introduce new structures to the area, but the solar panel structures would be low-profile and the lines created would mimic the naturally flat lines of the foreground landscape. The color of the solar modules, which is dark gray at this distance and perspective, already exists in the landscape. From viewing points further than approximately 0.25 miles from the solar field, at approximately the same elevation, the solar facility would largely fade into the flat landscape and not dominate the view. **(DEIR at 4.1-112).**

Even though the SGF components are out-of-character with directly adjacent land (which is primarily rural residential and fallow agriculture), the SGF is not out-of-character when considering the context of the surrounding landscape. Rural development and public infrastructure are common in the landscape around the Project 1 site, and include an 800-acre water treatment plant, roadways, the Antelope Valley Freeway, communication towers, and rural residences. Wind turbines located at the foot of the Tehachapi Mountains are visible from the site as well. Viewers such as nearby residents and travelers on the Antelope Valley Freeway and West Avenue D would still experience views of the open desert lands around the SGF after the facility is constructed (DEIR Figure 4.1-38). A 10-foot vegetative buffer is proposed to mitigate views directly along the southern Project 1 site boundary for 0.25 mile, where it is adjacent to West Avenue D. **(DEIR at 4.1-112).**

Because other structures including PV solar facilities are common in the vicinity of the Project 1 site and in the larger Project area, and because the site itself is not characterized by high visual quality, the visual impact of the site on the existing visual character of the proposed site and its surroundings would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.1-112).** Project 1's visual impacts are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

A-1 A Fugitive Dust Control Plan to minimize dust (visual pollution) shall be prepared and implemented.

A-2 The Project site shall be maintained free of debris, trash, and waste during construction.

A-3 The Project site shall be visually screened or partially screened during construction by fencing.

A-4 A landscape plan shall be developed for each Project prior to Project construction that shows the detail of a 10-foot wide screening vegetation buffer intended to screen or partially screen the Project visually from area residents or travelers on nearby roadways.

A-5 All lighting shall comply with applicable provisions of the Los Angeles County Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Lights shall be limited to types allowed by the ordinance, installed below maximum allowed heights, pointed downwards and shielded to minimize light trespass, and mounted on essential infrastructure rather than on separate light poles except where poles are required by regulation or by governing agency. Lighting will comply with the hours of operation requirements in the ordinance, and utilize automatic control devices to comply with time limits except where permitted by Los Angeles County. Lighting will be maintained in good repair at all times.

2.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant impact on Agriculture and Forestry Resources if it would: convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use; conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract; conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)); result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or 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.

Finding:

Project 1 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Agriculture and Forestry Resources. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

As currently mapped under 2010 data from the Department of Conservation ("DOC") Farmland Monitoring and Mapping Program ("FMMP"), the Project 1 site contains no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. **(DEIR at 4.2-5)**. Project 1 also contains no forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. **(DEIR at 4.2-8)**.

Project 1 is located within the Los Angeles County Zoning Ordinance designation A-1 (Light Agriculture), which does not contain provisions for renewable energy development. However, a zone change application has been submitted. The future zoning of the property is A-2 (Heavy Agriculture). According to LACDRP, a solar electricity generating facility is allowed in Zone A-2 with the issuance of a CUP. Furthermore, Project 1 will not preclude future agricultural uses. Project 1 and the gen-tie line are located within a LACDRP Agricultural Opportunity Area. The Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan Policy states that these areas should be protected from incompatible uses. The Antelope Valley Area Plan states that applications for non-agricultural uses in the LACDRP Agricultural Opportunity Area ("AOA") areas will be evaluated for their impact upon adjacent agricultural operations. **(DEIR at 4.2-6 to 4.2-7)**.

Project 1 would generate electrical power through renewable solar PV technology which is an allowable use on the site with a CUP and zone change. Project 1 would involve conversion of land that was formerly used for agricultural production to renewable energy production. Construction and operation of Project 1 would not involve other restrictions, obstructions, or resources that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. Additionally, Project 1 was last irrigated in 1972, and surrounding projects are mostly undeveloped and fallow agricultural land. Project 1 would produce power in a passive manner and would result in minimal air emissions, traffic, and noise, and would not affect adjacent agricultural operations. Additionally, the proposed property is not designated under a Williamson Act contract. As a result, construction and operation of Project 1 would not conflict with existing or proposed future zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, Project 1 impacts to existing agricultural use zoning, designated Agricultural Opportunity Areas, and Williamson Act contracts will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-7)**.

Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines will temporarily preclude future agricultural use at the Project 1 site location. Following the termination of power generating activities at the Project 1 Site, all facilities and equipment would be removed, and the land would be restored as near to its pre-development condition as possible, in the event a new similar land use is not contemplated at that time by then-current owners. A decommissioning and reclamation plan detailing land restoration activities will be provided, as required by Los Angeles County as part of the CUP approval. Additionally, the Applicant will be required to provide a decommissioning bond, or other suitable financial guarantee acceptable to the County, equal to the amount of money estimated to be required to decommission the Projects, including any additional environmental review which might become necessary, and restore the land to as near its pre-development condition as possible. The Project will not impact any land use outside the Project 1 site limits. Therefore, impacts regarding the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-8)**.

No mitigation measures are required for Agriculture and Forestry Resources.

2.3 AIR QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant impact on Air Quality if it would: conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; cumulatively produce a considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors); expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Air Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Pursuant to the Clean Air Act ("CAA"), the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District ("AVAQMD") is required to reduce project emissions of criteria pollutants for which the Mojave Desert Air Basin ("MDAB") is in non-attainment. Project 1 is located within a non-attainment area, which means that certain Project-related activities could potentially be subject to emission control strategies contained within the AVAQMD Federal 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan. Construction would involve activities that can result in emissions of particulate matter ("PM"). However, construction of PV panels and the generation-tie line would not require intense earthmoving activities, only the low-impact method of mowing the surface. Compliance with applicable rules, ordinances, plans, and policies would minimize PM emissions during construction. Project 1 construction emissions would not exceed emission thresholds, and would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-25)**. Since construction of Projects 1-6 would occur consecutively over the course of two years, construction of the six Projects could overlap, which may cause a peak in the Projects' daily construction emissions. However, maximum daily and annual construction emissions would not exceed the appropriate AVAQMD significant thresholds for all pollutants, even with the potential overlap in construction schedules. **(DEIR at 4.3-37)**.

During operation of Project 1, the Project site would undergo maintenance and security activities no more than 10 times annually (as needed), and would not create a daily increase in population or visitors. The assumption of 10 annual trips includes truck trips associated with panel washing. Project 1 would comply with AVAQMD rules and Los Angeles County ordinances, and is designed to be consistent with applicable county policies and the Attainment Plan. Therefore, Project 1 would not conflict with implementing the applicable air quality plan. **(DEIR at 4.3-25)**.

Project 1 emissions estimates are based on compliance with AVAQMD Rule 403 requirements for fugitive dust suppression, watering exposed surfaces two times daily. The short-term

emissions during Project 1 construction would not exceed AVAQMD significance thresholds. As such, Project 1 would not exceed thresholds, result in violating air quality standards, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. **(DEIR at 4.3-28)**. Likewise, even when all six Projects operate concurrently, the operation of all six Projects would not exceed annual thresholds, violate air quality standards, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. **(DEIR at 4.3-42)**.

Decommissioning of Project 1 (and each of the six Project sites) would require removal of the PV modules, PV module mounting system, electrical boxes, electrical inverters and transformers, electrical AC collection system, switchgear, data monitoring equipment, chain link perimeter security fencing, concrete ballasts, underground vaults, other concrete pads, and transporting all components off site. Air quality emissions from decommissioning would be generated from the pieces of equipment used and any fugitive dust from site preparation activities. Equipment used for decommissioning and removal of concrete ballasts, underground vaults, concrete pads, etc. generally would be similar to that used for construction, except that no mowing or clearing would be required.

Since decommissioning does not involve mowing or clearing activities, the level of fugitive dust emissions would be less than emissions created during construction. After removal of equipment and facilities, the site would need to be re-vegetated. Decommissioning would occur after at least 25 years of operation; therefore, equipment engine technology is likely to be more advanced, and fuels to be cleaner. Criteria pollutant emissions during decommissioning would be equal to or, more likely, less than those estimated from construction for Project 1, and will also be less than significant with mitigation. **(DEIR at 4.3-42)**. Similar to criteria pollutant emissions, hazardous air pollutant emissions during decommissioning would be less than during construction due to advanced equipment engine technology and cleaner fuel and would therefore be less than significant. Exhaust from off-road equipment and on-road vehicles used during decommissioning and construction truck trips would not be expected to create objectionable odors, and would therefore be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-42).**

The MDAB is currently nonattainment for federal and state ozone standards and nonattainment for state PM_{10} standards, which may cause emissions from Project 1 to contribute to an existing or projected air quality standard exceedance. Implementing any of the six Projects (including Project 1) would increase short-term emissions related to construction, and a negligible increase in long-term emissions related to SGF operation and maintenance. Construction for all six sites is expected to be staggered, and may extend over two years. Nevertheless, due to the nature and size of each site, simultaneous construction would not result in emissions of ozone precursors or PM_{10} that exceed daily thresholds. As shown in DEIR Table 4.3-12, "Mitigated Peak Daily Concurrent Construction Emissions", and DEIR Table 4.3-13, "Peak Annual Concurrent Construction Emissions", the impacts would be less than significant prior to mitigation. Implementing control strategies to reduce PM_{10} further minimizes air emissions. As such, construction of Project 1 would not 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). **(DEIR at 4.3-43)**.

During the operation phase, Project 1 will have no major emissions sources. Facility operating equipment that emits regulated air pollutants or requires AVAQMD permits is not planned at Project 1 or any of the six Project sites. As shown in DEIR Table 4.3-20, "Peak Annual Concurrent Operation Emissions", the impacts would be less than significant. As such, operation of Project 1 would not 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). **(DEIR at 4.3-44)**.

Project 1 was analyzed for air impacts to nearby sensitive receptors; however, sensitive receptors would only be exposed during construction activities. PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations are expected to occur primarily from fugitive dust emissions during mowing, excavation activities and, to a lesser degree, during PV installation and paving. Rule 401 requires that airborne particles remain on the site from which they originate under normal wind conditions. Proper mitigation techniques must be implemented to ensure that fugitive dust is contained. Emissions are not expected to expose even the closest sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and, due to the distance between Project sites, simultaneous construction at two sites would not significantly impact the same sensitive receptors. **(DEIR at 4.3-44)**.

Operational emissions from Project 1 would not impact local air pollutant levels at nearby receptors. As mentioned above, sensitive receptors would only be exposed, if at all, during construction activities. The primary source of Project emissions during operation is the vehicles used by facility maintenance staff traveling to and from the site. Maintenance is expected to occur no more than 10 times per year. Overall, Project 1 would not result in an increase in VMT over the course of one summer or winter day. Thus, Project 1 would not result in new long-term stationary sources, nor would they result in a significant number of net new vehicular trips. Carbon monoxide (CO) impacts from operation of Project 1 to sensitive receptors would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-44)**.

Short-term concentration levels during the construction phase will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, including those resulting in a cancer risk greater than the EPA screening levels. **(DEIR at 4.3-45)**. Due to continuous construction of each of the six Project sites over the course of two years (which may overlap), long-term cancer impacts from construction activities to the nearest sensitive receptors were evaluated, and found that even with the cumulative contribution of health risk impacts from all six proposed Projects, the cumulative cancer risk to the identified sensitive receptors is still below the cancer risk exposure level. **(DEIR at 4.3-46)**. Short-term concentration levels during Project 1 site construction will neither expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, nor exceed the cancer risk screening levels. **(DEIR at 4.3-47)**.

Project 1's Air Quality impacts are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

AQ-1 Water active sites at least twice daily (locations where soil disturbance is to occur would be thoroughly watered before earthmoving) during construction, or, in locations where water alone does not suffice to suppress dust adequately apply nontoxic chemical soil

stabilizers, according to manufacturers' specifications. Temporarily stockpiled soil shall be secured with tarps or plastic sheeting or sprayed with non-toxic soil stabilizers.

AQ-2 All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).

AQ-3 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.

AQ-4 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not idle more than five minutes in any one hour.

AQ-5 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operation of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.

AQ-6 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.

AQ-7 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.

AQ-8 During array area preparation, mowing shall be used instead of grading and/or disking, and shall be limited to no more than 3.5 acres per day per site to further reduce dust emissions during construction.

AQ-9 All interior roads shall use long-lasting non-toxic chemical soil stabilizers designed for long-term dust stabilization on dirt roads.

AQ-10 Interior array areas shall have re-established pre-existing vegetation or be established with drought tolerant, native, or native compatible vegetation approved by the County biologist and compliant with Fire Department requirements, within two years of energization authorization of an array area by the Department of Public Works, Building and Safety Division, to provide long-term dust stabilization under the arrays.

AQ-11 Earth disturbing activities shall be suspended and/or additional water shall be applied to meet Rule 403 criteria if wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour.

AQ-12 Construction activity shall utilize electricity from power poles on or adjacent to the Project sites rather than use of temporary diesel power generators and/or gasoline power generators when electricity with adequate circuit capacity is available from power poles in proximity to construction areas.

AQ-13 In the event temporary night lighting is necessary for construction or maintenance purposes, lighting not requiring the use of diesel or gasoline driven generators shall be used.

2.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant impact on biological resources if it would: 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 Wildlife ("CDFW") or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ("USFWS"); have a substantial adverse effect on sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations of CDFW or USFWS; have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including marshes, vernal pools, and coastal wetlands) or waters of the United States, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; 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; convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, southern California black walnut, etc.); conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas ("SEAs") (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Section 22.56.215), and the Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas ("SERAs"), (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Section 22.44, Part 6); or conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Biological Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 1 does not contain riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, wetlands, Joshua trees, or yucca trees on the site, and does not contain non-jurisdictional or state regulated waters. **(DEIR at 4.4-59)**. There are also no wetlands, vernal pools, or riparian habitat identified on the Project 1 site. No federally protected wetlands (including marshes, vernal pools, and coastal wetlands) or waters of the United States, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act

features, were identified on the Project 1 site. **(DEIR at 4.4-60)**. Project 1 does not contain oak trees, juniper trees, Joshua trees, or other unique native trees. **(DEIR at 4.4-62)**. Project 1 and the immediate vicinity do not contain or conflict with any Significant Ecological Areas ("SEAs"), Wildflower Reserve Areas, or Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas ("SERAs"). The closest SEAs to Project 1 are Fairmont and Antelope Buttes which are 4 miles south and Rosamond Lake which is 10 miles east. Therefore, Project 1 would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. **(DEIR at 4.4-63)**. There are also no adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plans in effect within the boundaries of the Project 1 site.

Project 1 has low potential for American badger, ferruginous hawk, merlin, and Le Conte's thrasher to occur onsite. There is moderate potential for mountain plover and burrowing owl to occur onsite based on habitat suitability. Burrowing owls were not observed onsite during 2013 targeted surveys but potential burrows were observed. In addition, although not a sensitive species, kit fox is plays an important role in providing burrow sites for burrowing owl and has potential to occur within Project 1. Potential for Swainson's hawk is low due to the lack of nesting and foraging habitat on the site. There is high potential for loggerhead shrike to occur onsite. Developing this site as a solar generating facility would remove habitat for this species and would result in a significant impact. Mitigation measures provided in Section 4.4.8 would reduce these impacts to less than significant; however, the 240 acres of land for Project 1 would be mostly unavailable as wildlife habitat during the life of Project 1. **(DEIR at 4.4-57)**.

Project 1 is located within an area of topographically homogeneous open space, and there are no local constraints to movement of resident or migratory wildlife that development of Project 1 would further aggravate. There are no known wildlife migration pathways that would be impacted by Project 1. **(DEIR 4.4-61)**.

Wildlife nursery areas on the Project 1 site may include nesting sites of native bird species, which are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-712; Ch. 128; July 13, 1918; 40 Stat. 755) and the California Fish and Game Code Section 3503. Burrowing owls may have suitable burrows on the Project 1 site, and protections for bird nesting and burrowing owls are provided in Mitigation Measures B-1, B-2, B-3 and B-4. The intent of acquiring mitigation lands would be to select available parcels that would replace lost breeding/foraging/winter foraging habitat and enhance the overall quality of habitat for a variety of species including migratory bird species. The potential to acquire parcels that would also maintain or enhance wildlife migration corridors in the area would also be considered. Planting of shrubs and native vegetation on the Project 1 site would improve the opportunities for shrub-nesting bird species on the Project 1 site when it is complete. **(DEIR 4.4-61)**.

Project 1 impacts to Biological Resources are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

B-1: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a qualified biologist shall be retained by the Applicant as the lead biological monitor subject to the approval of the LACDRP and CDFW. That person shall ensure that impacts to all biological resources are minimized or avoided, and shall conduct (or supervise) pre-grading field surveys for species that may be avoided, affected, or eliminated as a result of grading or any other site preparation activities. The lead biological monitor shall ensure that all surveys are conducted by

qualified personnel (e.g. avian biologists for bird surveys, herpetologists for reptile surveys, etc.) and that they possess all necessary permits and memoranda of understanding with the appropriate agencies for the handling of potentially-occurring special-status species. The lead biological monitor shall also ensure that daily monitoring reports (e.g., survey results, protective actions, results of protective actions, adaptive measures, etc.) are prepared, and shall make these monitoring reports available to LACDRP and CDFW at their request.

B-2: Pre-Construction surveys will be conducted prior to ground disturbance at each project site. These surveys will include all special-status species identified as having the potential to be present on the project site; including, but not limited to, badger, kit fox, southern grasshopper mouse, and the species listed below.

Pre-survey information gathering will include review of all available agency nest data and mapping.

- A focused pre-construction Swainson's hawk survey shall be conducted to locate any nesting sites within 5 miles of Projects 1 – 6. If Swainson's hawks or their active nests are located within 500 feet of the project sites, all construction-related work shall be postponed and CDFW will be consulted.

- Project-related activities likely to have the potential of disturbing suitable bird nesting habitat, which includes ground nesting birds, shall be prohibited from February 1 through August 31, unless a qualified monitoring biologist conducts nesting bird surveys prior to any construction-related disturbance to confirm the absence of active bird nests or bird nesting habitat. Disturbance shall be defined as any activity that physically removes or damages vegetation or habitat or any action that may cause disruption of nesting behavior such as loud noise from equipment or artificial night lighting. Surveys shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. If an active bird nest is discovered, disturbance within 500 feet for raptors shall be postponed until the nest is vacated, offspring are independent of the nest area and there is no evidence of further attempts at nesting. Limits of avoidance shall be marked with high-visibility flagging or fencing. The Applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures and submit the records to LACDRP and CDFW to document compliance with applicable state and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds.

- A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted on each site prior to grading. Pre-construction surveys for burrowing owl shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. The surveys shall follow the protocols set forth by the California Burrowing Owl Consortium (1993 and 2012).

  If burrowing owls are found during the pre-construction survey, then replacement burrows and habitat must be provided prior to the commencement of construction. The

Applicant shall be prepared to provide artificial replacement burrows in the event that owls are detected, either as wintering or breeding individuals.

Wintering individuals may be evicted with the use of exclusion devices followed by a period of seven days to ensure that animals have left their burrows. When it can be assured that owls are no longer using the burrows, the burrows can be hand-excavated and collapsed under the supervision of the avian biologist.

Breeding owls must not be disturbed and must be allowed to complete the raising of young until the fledglings can forage independently of adults and it can be confirmed that further attempts at nesting shall not be undertaken. When this has been confirmed, the owls can be evicted as described above for wintering animals.

- Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for special-status ground-dwelling reptiles, including but not limited to coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard. Surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground 4 to 6 weeks in advance of the survey effort, checking weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles or other species determined important by the qualified biological monitor (i.e., biologist must be appropriately permitted for collection and relocation activities) occurring within the work area prior to the start of work shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.

B-3: During grading, earthmoving activities, and other construction activities the biological monitor shall be present to inspect and enforce all mitigation requirements and to relocate any species that may come into harm's way to an appropriate offsite location of similar habitat. The biological monitor shall be authorized to stop specific grading or construction activities if violations of mitigation measures or any local, state, or federal laws are suspected. The biological monitor shall file a report of the monitoring activities with LACDRP and CDFW during construction activities, as frequently as required by LACDRP and CDFW. If ongoing biological monitoring of construction activities reveals the presence of any special-status reptiles within an active work area, then work shall be temporarily halted until the animals can be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones. Work areas shall be surveyed for special-status reptile species, such as the coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard, during construction activities. During the construction, surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground in appropriate work areas and checking them weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles occurring within the work area shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.

B-4: Mitigation lands shall be acquired for Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, special-status migratory and wintering birds, and alkali mariposa lily.

Swainson's hawk: Impacts due to development of the projects shall be mitigated by the acquisition of good quality Swainson's hawk habitat targeted within the Antelope Valley. Land shall be purchased or placed in a conservation easement or other suitable deed restriction and managed to maintain suitable habitat in perpetuity.

The proposed development is not expected to result in the "take" of Swainson's hawk; however, the Applicant shall be required to consult CDFW in the event of take, which may result in additional mitigation prescribed by CDFW. Although the Projects are not expected to result in "take" of Swainson's hawk, mitigation will still be required to alleviate the effects of cumulative impacts on raptor, migratory bird, and burrowing owl habitats:

Replacement land will be provided based on the quality of the mitigation land relative to the impacted habitat. The ratio of such replacement shall be determined as follows:

- A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 3 acres of development if the replacement land is superior nesting and foraging habitat contiguous to occupied nesting and foraging habitat, and is within a designated or proposed SEA.

- A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 2 acres of development if the replacement land is unoccupied irrigated land, contiguous to occupied habitat and providing superior quality foraging habitat with trees or other such nesting habitat;

- A ratio of 1 acre of replacement land for each acre of development if the replacement land provides similar foraging and nesting habitat.

Burrowing Owl: Mitigation for any occupied burrowing owl burrows found during preconstruction surveys will include a comprehensive tiered approach:

- Pre-construction and construction monitoring surveys conducted by a qualified biologist to detect potential new owl activity onsite;

- Disturbance avoidance of occupied burrows during nesting period February 1 – August 31;

- Impact avoidance of occupied burrows;

- Burrow exclusion and closure and offsite relocation (>100 m), as described previously in in B-2, will be conducted for unavoidable impacts to occupied burrows (after consultation with CDFW).

- Minimizing impacts by protecting in-place any owls, their burrows, and their immediate habitat by establishing setback zones and visual screens for burrows adjacent to construction activity; by placing visible markers, and by conducting construction worker awareness training. Setback widths will be applied as appropriate to the level of existing disturbance and owl stage of activity (e.g., for low to moderate construction-related disturbance activity outside the nesting season near burrows in currently high-traffic or disturbance areas, it is assumed owls are adapted to human disturbance and will not need a large setback).

- Mitigating unavoidable impacts to habitat: restore temporary impacts to pre-existing conditions; replace nesting/occupied and satellite burrows lost with the same number of suitable burrows on the mitigation site. Mitigation acreage for foraging habitat provided for Swainson's hawk will be sufficient to replace lost burrowing owl habitat because the hawk's replacement habitat will be in-kind or better (i.e., the Project habitat is low quality overall and mitigation habitat will be at least the same quality as the lost habitat OR will have higher quality habitat features overall, such as increased vegetative structure, higher numbers of prey species, less disturbance, and less potential for predation by domestic animals, etc.). Specific habitat considerations as provided in the CDFW 2012 burrowing owl guidance will be considered in selecting the overall habitat replacement acres for the project.

Alkali Mariposa Lily: Alkali mariposa lily will be avoided to the greatest extent possible. If preconstruction surveys reveal individuals that cannot be avoided, mitigation of lost alkali mariposa lily shall be provided at a minimum 1:1 ratio. This acreage will be calculated with input from LACDRP and CDFW. Additionally, because alkali mariposa Lilies have locally available seed sources, plantings of the lilies on appropriate soil types on Projects shall be implemented in selected areas. The lilies may also be transplanted from areas planned for disturbance to more suitable locations in the Project area. Transplantation locations must be situated within adequately buffered areas to be found suitable.

For all species the mitigation acreage may be located within the Project sites, but outside of the area of development, subject to LACDRP and CDFW approval, if acreage of sufficient quantity and quality exists.

B-5: Review and Approval of Habitat Management Lands Prior to Acquisition: The Applicant shall provide a mitigation land acquisition proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for their approval before acquiring the property. The proposal shall discuss the suitability of the property by comparing it to the selection criteria. As a part of the preparation of the land acquisition proposal, acreage quantification by habitat category will be developed with LACDRP and CDFW based on the following criteria:

> **Habitat Management Land Selection Criteria**: The Applicant must identify the region within which lands shall be acquired, and the type and quality of habitat to be acquired.
>
> Detailed criteria and acreage for each habitat category will be developed with Los Angeles County and CDFW. Foraging habitat shall be assessed as moderate to good with a capacity to improve in quality and value to Swainson's hawks, and must be within the Antelope Valley Swainson's hawk breeding range. Foraging habitat with suitable nest trees is preferred.
>
> **Habitat Management Lands Acquisition:** Prior to initiating ground-disturbing activities, the Applicant shall provide a proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for off-site mitigation land to be restored, enhanced, or maintained according to the requirements of the biological mitigation measures in this EIR. The proposal will require that mitigation lands identified shall be preserved as open space in perpetuity. Within 45 days of

acquiring the mitigation land(s), the Applicant shall record a permanent deed restriction on the mitigation land(s) to be preserved as open space. The deed restriction or conservation easement language shall be submitted to LACDRP and CDFW for review and approval prior to recordation. Alternatively, should a conservation easement on the mitigation land be offered, the permanent conservation easement shall be recorded to the satisfaction of LACDRP and CDFW.

The Applicant shall establish a fund sufficient for the restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation land(s) until such time when the mitigation land(s) become self-sustaining and until such time as the mitigation land(s) meet the requirements of this mitigation measure. The fund shall be established within 90 days of mitigation land(s) acquisition in an amount acceptable to the LACDRP and CDFW.

Land Acquisition Schedule and Financial Assurances: The Applicant shall complete acquisition, or execute an irrevocable option to purchase, of proposed Habitat Management lands and shall provide financial assurances for dedicating adequate funding for impact avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, if necessary, prior to the issuance of building permits. If an irrevocable option to purchase is utilized, the Applicant shall provide a proposed date of purchase which coincides with construction of the facility.

B-6: Prior to alteration of any streambeds, the Applicant shall enter into an agreement with the CDFW, pursuant to Sections 1601 through 1603 of the State Fish and Game Code.

B-7: Within all interior portions of the site within and adjacent to the proposed solar arrays, re-vegetation shall be accomplished (excluding interior roads) as follows:

Vegetation seeded in these areas shall comprise locally-sourced, native species if available, or, native compatible as approved by the County biologist if sufficient locally-sourced native seed stock is not available, approximating low-growing communities such as native perennial or annual grasslands (i.e., wildflower fields). Shrub species shall not be used due to these species inability to survive continued vegetation trimming. Vegetation shall be maintained in accordance with Los Angeles County Fire Department regulations.

2.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant effect on Cultural Resources if it would: cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5; cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Cultural Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

One historic-era site was identified within Project 1, "Site P-19-004222", which is a complex of partially demolished and dilapidated farm structures. Site P-19-004222 is in ruins, and lacks any physical integrity from its period of significance (c, 1950s) and the recordation of surface artifacts has likely exhausted the date potential for the site. P19-004222 is recommended as not eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources ("CRHR") or National Register of Historic Places ("NRHP") and no further management consideration of the resource is necessary. Therefore, construction and operation of Project 1 will cause no change in its level of significance. **(DEIR at 4.5-22)**.

There is a possibility that historical and/or archaeological materials would be uncovered during necessary subsurface excavations for the construction of the proposed Project 1. Although the likelihood of encountering archaeological resources on the site is considered low, this impact is potentially significant. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, which describes procedures to be followed in the event that cultural resources are discovered, is required. CUL-1 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-22)**.

No archeological resources were detected during the transect survey. Therefore, Project 1 would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. There is a possibility that historical and/or archaeological materials would be uncovered during necessary subsurface excavations for the construction of the proposed Project 1. Although the likelihood of encountering archaeological resources on the site is considered low, this impact is potentially significant. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, which describes procedures to be followed in the event that cultural resources are discovered, is required. CUL-1 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-27).**

Likewise, no paleontological resources were detected during the transect survey. Based on the paleontological assessment, it is unlikely that any intact significant paleontological resources are or will be located on the property. Therefore, Project 1 would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources. If Project 1 excavations reach 10 feet or more below current grade and reveal that older Quaternary deposits and/or the later Miocene deposits are exposed, there will be a higher potential for encountering significant vertebrate fossil remains. Deep cuts should be inspected by a qualified paleontologist in an attempt to identify the more sensitive older alluvial strata. There is a possibility that paleontological materials would be uncovered if excavations for the construction of Project 1 reach a depth of 10 feet or more below current grade. Although the likelihood of encountering paleontological resources within the Project 1 area is considered low, this impact is potentially significant. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure PALEO-1, the development of a Paleontological Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Plan ("PRMMP") by a qualified paleontologist if construction excavation depth

is below 10 feet or more below current grade, is required. PALEO-1 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-30)**.

There is no indication as a result of this study that human remains are present within the boundaries of Project 1. The records search and the field survey indicate no evidence of human remains on or near the sites. Project-related earth disturbance, however, has the potential to unearth previously undiscovered remains, resulting in a potentially significant impact. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2 that describes procedures to be followed in the event that human remains are discovered would ensure that impacts are reduced to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-32)**.

Project 1 impacts related to Cultural Resources are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

CUL-1: In the event cultural resources are encountered during construction of the Projects, all ground-disturbing activities within the vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall be notified of the find. The archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to recordation and excavation of the finds and evaluation and processing of the finds in accordance with § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of, but are not limited to, stone, bone, fossils, wood or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites.

If the resources are determined to be unique historic resources as defined under § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, Mitigation Measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate Mitigation Measures for significant resources could include but not be limited to avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds.

No further earthwork shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any archaeological artifacts recovered because of mitigation will be donated to a qualified scientific institution approved by the Lead Agency where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.

CUL-2: In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, California State Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 dictates that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to CEQA regulations and PRC § 5097.98. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.

PALEO-1: A qualified paleontologist shall be retained by the Applicant prior to excavations reaching 10 feet in depth or greater. The paleontologist shall develop and execute a PRMMP and supervise a paleontological monitor whom shall monitor all ground-disturbing activities associated with such excavations. The Program will outline the procedures to follow in regards to paleontological resources (e.g. monitoring protocols, curation, data recovery of fossils, reporting). If fossils are found during such excavation, the paleontological monitor shall be authorized to halt ground-disturbing activities within 25 feet of the find in order to allow evaluation of the find and determination of appropriate treatment according to the Program.

2.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant effect on Geology and Soils if it would: expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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 active fault trace; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides; result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; 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; be located on expansive soil; have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater; or conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance or hillside design standards in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element.

Finding:

Project 1 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Geology and Soils. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 1 and the Project 1 gen-tie line are not located in an active or potentially active fault zone according to the California Geological Survey ("CGS") Seismic Hazard Zone Maps (CGS 2008) and Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map (CGS 2010). The closest fault zones are the San Andreas Fault Zone, which is located approximately 10.5 miles to the south southwest of the Project 1 site, and the Garlock Fault Zone, which is located approximately 15.5 miles northwest of the Project 1 site. Based on research and available information, Project 1 is susceptible to

seismicity, but is not susceptible to fault rupture; therefore, impacts involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-13)**.

The United States Geological Survey ("USGS") National Seismic Hazard Map (2008) indicates that Project 1 and the Project 1 gen-tie line are located in an area mapped from 30 to 40 percent gravity for peak horizontal acceleration with a 10 percent probability of exceedance in the next 50 years. According to the USGS, and dependent on structural design, 10 percent gravity is the lower threshold at which damages to structures are likely to occur. Based on geologic and soil conditions at the site, the USGS Ground Motion Parameter Calculator indicates that Project 1 facilities will need to be designed to sustain spectral accelerations of approximately 0.075 to 0.217 percent gravity (USGS 2012). **(DEIR at 4.6-15)**.

Project 1 has the potential to be subjected to ground motion during construction. However, because of the temporary nature of the construction period relative to the frequency of occurrence of significant seismic events, the potential for Project 1 construction to expose people or structures to substantially adverse effects due to seismicity and ground motion will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-15)**. During operation of the facility, all Project 1 structures and operational facilities will be designed in accordance with the California Building Code ("CBC") and applicable industry standards. The design and construction of Project 1 would comply with all applicable building codes and standards established by regulatory agencies, including the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the CBC. Therefore, Project 1 impacts related to seismic shaking and strong ground motion hazards would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-15)**.

The CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) does not identify Project 1 or the Project 1 gen-tie line as being located in zones with the potential for liquefaction or ground failure. Additionally, Project 1 is located on poorly sorted coarse grained materials with groundwater typically greater than 150 feet below ground surface (bgs) (USGS 2008). Based on available geologic information, the potential susceptibility of ground failure is less than significant for Project 1 construction and operation. **(DEIR at 4.6-19)**.

Project 1 and associated gen-tie lines contains generally low slopes of less than 1 percent gradient. As indicated in the Project description, development of the solar facility would not result in significant changes to existing site grades, and would not increase the susceptibility to slope failure. Additionally, the CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) does not identify Project 1 as being located in zones susceptible to landslides or slope failure. Therefore, the potential susceptibility for slope failure and landslides during construction and operation is less than significant for Project 1. **(DEIR at 4.6-20)**.

The soil series at the location of Project 1 and the Project 1 gen-tie line was indicated to be Rosamond fine sandy loam. This soil series has an erosion factor of 0.32 to 0.37, indicating a medium susceptibility to water erosion, and a wind erodibility group of 3, indicating a low to medium susceptibility to wind erosion. Implementation of appropriate erosion and sediment control BMPs will be implemented during construction and operation of Project 1, as outlined in Draft EIR Hydrology Section 4.9 and Air Quality Section 4.3, and will mitigate potential impacts to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.6-21)**.

Based on the information in the Geotechnical Critical Issues Analyses and Custom Soil Resource Reports prepared by Tetra Tech, the location of Project 1 and the Project 1 gen-tie line contains generally low gradient slopes. Development of solar facilities will not result in significant changes to existing site grades, and will not increase the susceptibility to slope failure. Additionally, the CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) indicates that Project 1 is not susceptible to landslide or liquefaction hazards. Although subsidence has occurred throughout the Antelope Valley, the majority of subsidence has been concentrated near the City of Lancaster and was caused by excessive groundwater pumping and decreased water levels. Subsidence in the vicinity of Project 1 was between 0 to 2 feet from 1930 to 1992. Surficial evidence such as fissures and differential settling has not been observed at or near the location of Project 1. Based on historic rates of subsidence and a relatively stabilizing water level due to reduced pumping and proposed aquifer management, future subsidence is expected to be minimal. In the event that minor future subsidence does occur, the potential impact to the proposed structural design (post mounted racking systems and relatively small foundations for electrical equipment) would be minimal. Based on geologic data and the proposed construction and operation as described in the Project description, Project 1 impacts to on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-23)**.

The soil series at the location of Project 1 and the Project 1 gen-tie line was indicated to be Rosamond fine sandy loam. This soil series is rated for a low shrink/swell potential. The potential for expansive soils to affect Project 1 is less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-25)**.

Project 1 does not propose the use of any sanitary facilities that will require septic tanks or sanitary wastewater disposal during either construction or operation. Therefore, no impact will occur. Project 1 (and gen-tie lines) are located on the floor of the Antelope Valley where the terrain is nearly flat. Project 1 is not in the hillside area and are not affected by Hillside Management Areas. **(DEIR at 4.6-26)**.

2.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant impact related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change if it would: generate direct or indirect GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment, based on any applicable threshold of significance; or conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 1's short-term GHG emissions during the construction phase (maximum daily emissions of 7,064 pounds per day) would not exceed the AVAQMD significance threshold for maximum

daily emissions (548,000 pounds per day). As such, Project 1 would not exceed thresholds or result in violating GHG standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected GHG violation. **(DEIR at 4.7-20)**.

Because construction of the six Project sites may overlap, concurrent construction emissions of Projects 1-6 were analyzed by emissions per year and thus compared to the annual GHG threshold of 100,000 metric tons of CO_{2e} per year, for long-term emissions. The unmitigated peak annual construction levels for all six Project sites are expected to result in annual GHG emissions below the most stringent annual threshold proposed by the AVAQMD (100,000 tons per year). As such, the Project will not exceed thresholds or result in violating GHG standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected GHG violation. **(DEIR at 4.7-23)**.

During operations, Project 1 facility operation would be limited to general maintenance, panel washing, and security. The primary source of emissions during operations is mainly the vehicles used by facility maintenance staff to and from the site. It is anticipated that operations and maintenance would utilize one water truck for panel washing and one light duty truck twice per year. Although Project 1 is scheduled for bi-annual panel washing, a maximum of ten trips were assumed for each Project (four round trips plus one additional round trip to be conservative). The operation emissions provided for each Project are considered the Project's baseline emissions, since it does not include any solar energy reductions. Because operations-related GHG emissions are considered long term, the AVAQMD daily significance threshold of 100,000 metric tons of CO_{2e} per year was used to analyze impacts during operations. The total annual operational emissions for Project 1 are 6.04 tons of CO_{2e} per year, which is well below the AVAQMD threshold of 100,000 tons per year. **(DEIR at 4.7-24)**. Likewise, concurrent operation of all six Projects is estimated to generate approximately 31 metric tons of CO_{2e} annually, which is well below the AVAQMD threshold. **(DEIR at 4.7-27)**.

Construction-related emissions from Project 1 would be temporary and finite in nature, below the applicable thresholds, and are consistent with the AB 32 Scoping Plan. Accordingly, Project 1's construction-related GHG emissions would not be a cumulatively considerable contribution to climate change. Project 1's operational GHG emissions would be negligible and not comprise a cumulatively considerable contribution to climate change and, therefore, would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.7-28).**

Furthermore, with implementation of Project 1, there would be an added environmental benefit of displacing GHG emissions in the region. The solar energy generation would offset emissions from electricity usage, which would otherwise be produced by fossil-fueled power generation facilities using petroleum, natural gas, or coal combustion. Project 1 would result in a temporary increase in GHG emissions which is below the most stringent proposed threshold; employ active solar technologies supportive of the state's goals to reduce GHG emissions; and is consistent with the County of Los Angeles's goals. **(DEIR at 4.7-29)**.

Project 1 would therefore be in accordance with the state's need for the construction of renewable energy power plants to meet the state's GHG reduction objectives including:

- California's RPS that requires California's investor-owned electric utilities to obtain 20 percent of the electricity that they supply by 2010 from renewable sources;

- Executive Order S-14-08, which established the RPS targets for California that "all retail sellers of electricity shall serve 33 percent of their load with renewable energy by 2020";

- Executive Order S-03-05 on climate change to advance renewable energy and other solutions to reduce California's GHG emissions; and

- The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) that established a comprehensive program of regulatory and market mechanisms to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020.

Project 1 includes various project design features and objectives that address global climate change and reduce GHG emissions, as do each of the Projects 1-6. Project design features include aspects of the Project that either must be incorporated as part of the conditions of approval, or that the Applicant has committed to include to reduce GHG impacts associated with the Project. The Projects would be designed to reduce emissions through specific goals set. The expected Project features would directly or indirectly result in lower emissions of GHGs. The Project design features that address global climate change impacts include the following:

- Vegetation to sequester GHGs
    - Preserve natural areas by mowing, which maintains the organic material in the soil
    - Preserve open space by limiting constructing on portions of Project site
    - Plant trees and shrubs along the edges as buffers to adjacent receptors

- Construction limitations to minimize GHG emissions
    - Limit construction equipment idling beyond regulation requirements
    - Limit number of simultaneous construction projects by phasing

As such, Project 1 would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation to reduce GHG emissions. **(DEIR at 4.7-30)**. In addition to the Project design features listed above, the Project's impacts related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

GHG-1 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.

GHG-2 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not idle more than five minutes in any one hour.

GHG-3 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operations of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.

GHG-4 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.

GHG-5 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.

2.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant effect on Hazards and Hazardous Materials if it would: create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment; emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses; be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; for a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires, due to location within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4); expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, due to location within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires due to location within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires due to location within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard; or constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 1 would not require extensive or ongoing use of hazardous materials. Hazardous materials used during the construction of Project 1 would be typical of most construction projects of this type. Hazardous materials used during construction activities may include gasoline, diesel fuel, oils, lubricants, solvents, detergents, degreasers, paints, and other supplies. All hazardous materials would be transported, stored, and properly disposed of in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. The accidental release of hazardous materials or wastes during construction activities is possible. The accidental release of hazardous materials or wastes would be promptly contained and abated in accordance with all applicable laws and regulatory requirements, and therefore is not expected to result in a significant impact. **(DEIR at 4.8-11)**. During operation of Project 1, limited quantities of hazardous materials would be stored on-site. These materials would include fire suppressant and transformer insulating oil (mineral oil). The mineral oil would be contained within Project 1 electrical transformers and switches. Project 1 would develop and implement a hazardous materials and hazardous waste management program for both construction and operational phases. The program would include the following, as required by applicable regulations. **(DEIR at 4.8-11)**.

- **Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste Handling:** The construction contractor would prepare a Project-specific hazardous materials management and hazardous waste management program for Project 1. This program would be implemented prior to the start of construction activities. The program would prescribe proper hazardous material use, storage, and disposal requirements, as well as hazardous waste management procedures. The program would identify specific types of hazardous materials to be used during Project 1 construction and operation, and specific types of wastes that will be generated. All personnel would be provided with Project-specific training. These programs would be developed to ensure that all hazardous materials and hazardous wastes would be handled and disposed of in a safe and environmentally sound manner consistent with all applicable laws and regulations. Employees and contractor personnel handling wastes would receive hazardous materials training and be trained in hazardous waste procedures, spill contingencies, waste minimization procedures and treatment, storage, and disposal facility ("TSDF") training in accordance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration ("OSHA") Hazard Communication Standard and 22 CCR. Prior to the start of construction of Project 1, a Hazardous Materials Business Plan ("HMBP") will be prepared and submitted in accordance with Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code and Title 22 CCR, as required by the Certified Unified Program Agency.

- **Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan:** The construction contractor would prepare a site-specific SWPPP for review and approval by the appropriate regulatory agencies and implement it prior to the start of demolition or construction activities at Project 1. The SWPPP would utilize BMPs to address the storage and handling of hazardous materials and sediment runoff during demolition and construction activities.

- **Transport of Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Wastes:** Hazardous materials transported by truck would include fuel (diesel fuel and gasoline) and oils and lubricants

for equipment. Transportation of hazardous waste may include hazardous building materials and small amounts of construction waste such as waste oils, solvents, or cleaners. The construction contractor would prepare written procedures for the transport of hazardous materials and hazardous waste in accordance with the California Vehicle Code, California Highway Patrol Regulations (CCR Title 13); Department of Transportation Regulations, Title 49, CFR; and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regulations, Title 40 CFR, and CCR 22 regulations prior to the start of construction activities at Project 1.

- **Fueling and Maintenance of Construction Equipment:** The construction contractor would prepare written procedures for the fueling and maintenance of construction equipment prior to the start of construction activities at Project 1. Vehicles and equipment would be refueled off-site or on-site by refueling trucks. If on-site refueling or maintenance activities are required, refueling and maintenance procedures would include implementation of BMPs to ensure that chemicals do not come in contact with the ground. Equipment will be inspected daily for potential leakage or failures.

- **Emergency Release Response Procedures:** The construction contractor would prepare an Emergency Release Response Plan ("ERRP") detailing the response to releases of hazardous materials. The ERRP would be prepared prior to the start of construction activities at Project 1. The ERRP would prescribe hazardous materials handling procedures for reducing the potential for a release during construction activities, and would include an emergency response program to ensure the rapid and safe cleanup of any accidental spills. All hazardous material spills of threatened release would be immediately reported. All construction and operations personnel would be aware of federal, state, and local emergency response reporting guidelines. Implementation of the aforementioned hazardous materials and hazardous waste management programs would reduce the potential impacts associated with the handling, transport, and use of hazardous materials during both construction and operation of Project 1 to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.8-12)**.

If lead based paint is found during construction of Project 1, the Applicant would comply with County requirements and provide a copy of the qualifications/license of the lead based paint abatement contractor that will perform the abatement or removal of lead based paint to the Department of Public Works Building and Safety Division and the County of Los Angeles Fire Department Health and Hazardous Materials Division. If required by the County, the Applicant would prepare and submit a Hazardous Building Materials Demolition Assessment and Management Plan to the Department of Public Works and Fire Department for review and approval to ensure compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local laws, and regulations. OSHA regulations are in place to assure that these materials are safely removed prior to or during demolition and renovation activities. In compliance with regulations requiring removals by firms and individuals licensed to do such work pursuant to applicable regulations the Project's potential impacts regarding lead exposure would be less than significant. Implementation of the aforementioned ERRP would reduce the potential impacts associated with upset and accidental release conditions at Project 1 (and gen-tie lines) to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.8-13)**.

Project 1 would convert sunlight directly into electrical energy without the creation of hazardous emissions, and no impact to sensitive land uses would occur as a result of hazardous emissions. The primary emissions created by Project 1 (and gen-tie lines) would be air emissions from vehicle and equipment exhaust generated during construction activities. Potential impacts due to air emissions created during construction and maintenance activities at Project 1 would be less than significant, as discussed in Section 4.3 of the DEIR. **(DEIR at 4.8-13)**.

Based on the Environmental Data Review ("EDR"), the location of Project 1 and the Project 1 gen-tie line is included on a list of hazardous materials sites complied pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The location of Project 1 was indicated to contain a 500 gallon underground storage tank ("UST"). Prior to the start of construction activities at Project 1, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment ("Phase I ESA") would be conducted to evaluate the potential hazards associated with the previously abandoned UST located at the Project 1 site. A closure permit for the UST will be verified or obtained from the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Health Hazardous Materials Division. Based on the information compiled in the Project 1 EDR, potential Project 1 impacts due to site hazards to the public and environment would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.8-14)**.

Project 1 and gen-tie lines are not located within an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public use airport. Therefore, Project 1 would have no impact on public use airports. **(DEIR at 4.8-15)**. Project 1 is located approximately 2 miles northwest of the Little Buttes Antique Airfield Airport, which is a privately-owned dirt airstrip. Little Buttes Antique Airfield Airport has not adopted a land use plan. Project 1 is not expected to significantly alter surrounding land use or result in the construction of features greater in height than those already present in the surrounding areas. The solar generating facilities would introduce minimal amounts of glare to the existing landscape. The PV modules are designed to absorb sunlight, and the glass modules that protect the PV surface are typically formulated glass designed to allow sunlight to pass with minimal reflection. As stated in DEIR Section 4.1 Aesthetics, construction activities would be limited to daylight hours and any lighting that may occur would be in compliance with the requirements of the Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Therefore, the Project 1 impacts on people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airstrip would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.8-16)**.

Emergency response and evacuation procedures for Project 1 would be coordinated by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department ("LACSD") and the Los Angeles County Fire Department ("LACFD"). During Project 1 construction activities, the LACSD and LACFD require that adequate vehicular access be provided and maintained. The Traffic Control Plan for Project 1 would provide for the required access of emergency vehicles during construction activities. During operation of Project 1, Project operation staff would work with both the LACSD and the LACFD to ensure adequate emergency procedures are in place. The HMBP would include an Emergency Response Plan. Additionally, an Emergency Action Plan and a Fire Prevention Plan would be prepared for Project 1 as required by Cal/OSHA. These plans would ensure that Project 1 would have established plans and procedures for responding to emergency situations, and would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, Project 1 impacts to emergency

response plans or emergency evacuation plans would be less than significant during both construction and operations. **(DEIR at 4.8-17)**.

Project 1 is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. No impact would occur in this regard. **(DEIR at 4.8-17)**. A public water system for fire control does not exist near Project 1. The facility design includes a dedicated 10,000-gallon fire water storage tank to be installed and maintained at Project 1, in compliance with LACFD Regulation 19 and other applicable Fire Department water tank specifications. Because the SGF design includes a dedicated fire water tank meeting Fire Department requirements, the water and pressure would meet fire flow needs. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.8-18)**.

Project 1 is surrounded by rural agricultural lands with no industrial uses, manufacturing uses, or other particularly high fire hazard uses in the vicinity. Project 1 would comply with all applicable Fire Code and County and City ordinance requirements, and fire safety standards, as stated in DEIR Section 4.12 Public Safety. A Fire Management Plan, which would be prepared for Project 1, establishes standards and practices that would minimize the risk of fire and, in the event of fire, provide for immediate suppression and notification. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(DEIR at 4.8-18)**.

Project 1 will convert sunlight into electrical energy through a process which would not constitute a fire hazard. All materials and equipment used in the construction of each facility would be specified based on applicable codes and building regulations. Welding activities may also potentially result in the combustion of brush and vegetation. A Fire Protection and Prevention Plan would reduce these potential impacts to less than significant. A Fire Prevention Plan would be prepared for Project 1 as required by Cal/OSHA, and Project 1 would include a dedicated 10,000- gallon fire water storage tank in compliance with LACFD Regulation 19. Therefore, Project 1 does not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard, and would have a less than significant impact on fire hazards in the area. **(DEIR at 4.8-19)**.

Project 1 impacts related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

HH-1 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Materials Management and Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.

HH-2 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.

HH-3 Prior to the start of construction activities on the parcel containing the historic UST at the location of Project 1, a Phase I ESA will be completed. This mitigation measure only applies to Project 1.

HH-4 Prior to the start of construction activities, a closure permit for the UST will be verified or obtained from the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Health Hazardous Materials Division. This mitigation measure only applies to Project 1.

HH-5 Construction activities shall be halted if previously unidentified soil contamination is observed or indicated by testing during any earthwork activities. Construction will be halted or redirected until such soil contamination is evaluated and disposed of and/or treated.

2.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a potentially significant impact on Hydrology and Water Quality if it would: violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; 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; substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; 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; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality; conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52); result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance; use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course); otherwise substantially degrade water quality; 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, or within a floodway or floodplain; place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain; 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; or place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

A Notice of Intent form would be submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board ("SWRCB") to apply for coverage under the NPDES General Permit for construction of Project 1. During construction, Project 1 would implement BMPs as specified in the site-specific SWPPP. The SWPPP would be developed by a State of California certified Qualified SWPPP Developer ("QSD") and during construction monitored by a State of California certified Qualified SWPPP Practitioner ("QSP"). The SWPPP would be approved by the County and uploaded to the State via the State SMARTs system prior to Project 1 ground-breaking. The SWPPP would identify construction-phase BMPs to be implemented. With implementation of the BMPs, Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines would only have the potential to generate less than significant effects on groundwater and/or stormwater runoff, and will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during construction. **(DEIR at 4.9-34; 4.9-38)**.

During Project 1 operations, mechanical equipment on the solar farm would either be made of pollutant free materials or fitted with special containment units to house any possible drips or spills of lubricants, oils, or other chemicals. Maintenance activities, including solar array washing, would be performed with clean water and allowed to evaporate or drip to the ground. Maintenance and operations personnel would be required to maintain all necessary spill prevention, control, and countermeasures on hand during site visits. These spill response kits would include, but are not limited to, personal protective equipment, spill pads, absorbents, booms, shovels, garbage bags, plastic sheeting, and disposal drums. Permanent treatment BMPs would include infiltration basins to preserve water quality. With these spill prevention, control, and countermeasures on-site, there would be a less than significant impact on groundwater and stormwater runoff quality, and Project 1 will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during operation. **(DEIR at 4.9-34; 4.9-38).**

As stated in Section 4.14.5 of the DEIR, water would be required for dust control measures during the duration of construction efforts. An analysis of the water supply, including the use of well water, is presented in DEIR Section 4.14 Utilities and Service Systems. At the outset of construction, water would be supplied via truck to meet the demands of Project 1. Well water is not considered available at this time, and would be reevaluated upon a change in status. The demands of Project 1 are anticipated to have a less than significant impact on the region's groundwater supplies. Furthermore, construction activities are not anticipated to interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. As stated in Section 4.14.5 of the DEIR, water may be required in the first few years of operation to establish the mature vegetation planted after construction. Similar to the construction period, water would be supplied via truck to Project 1. The volume of water required would be considerably less than the water required for construction activities. Well water would be considered if its availability changes. As with construction, impacts to the region's groundwater supplies are anticipated to be less than significant with operation of Project 1. Also, the effect on groundwater recharge by the development's increase in impervious surface will be mitigated by the proposed infiltration basins. These infiltration basins will allow the increase in runoff volume from the proposed development (up to the 25-year storm event) to infiltrate on-site and recharge the groundwater basin. Therefore, less than significant impacts to groundwater recharge are anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-35)**.

During construction of Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines, soils would be disturbed through activities such as minor grading and vegetation removal, which could lead to issues with soil erosion and siltation on- and off-site. Through the implementation of construction control measures per California Association of Stormwater Quality Agencies ("CASQA") standards (silt fencing, fiber rolls, and sandbag barriers), Project 1 would have less than significant impacts on erosion and debris deposition during construction (CASQA 2003). Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines would require minor grading on-site which would not drastically change the existing drainage patterns or natural channels. Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan ("SUSMP")/Low Impact Development ("LID") Reports would help account for the increase in runoff erosion capabilities resulting from the developments' increase in impervious surfaces. The infiltration basins would help reduce flow velocities and the sediment load of the runoff, which would lower the erosion and siltation capabilities of the runoff. Therefore, Project 1 would result in less than significant impacts to erosion and siltation on- and off-site. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines would require minor grading on-site, which would not drastically change the existing drainage patterns or natural channels. The increase in runoff flow rates and volumes from the developments' increase in impervious surfaces would be addressed by Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7. The infiltration basins, created by elevated road sections, would capture the increase in runoff volume (up to the 25-year storm event) and allow it to infiltrate on-site. The remaining runoff would flow over the road section and return to pre-development flow conditions before leaving the project site. With this measure, less than significant impacts would occur related to flooding on- and off-site. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7 would address the increase in runoff flow rates and volumes from the developments' increase in impervious surfaces. The infiltration basins, created by elevated road sections, would capture the increase in runoff volume (up to the 25-year storm event) and allow it to infiltrate on-site. The remaining runoff would flow over the road section and return to predevelopment flow conditions before leaving the Project site. The basins would be placed within the first half of the site to allow flows over the roads sections enough time to normalize before leaving Project 1. Project soils would treat the captured runoff at the infiltration basins. Therefore, less than significant impacts to existing or planned stormwater drainage systems are anticipated. Also, significant impacts to polluted runoff are not anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines would incorporate Los Angeles County LID standards, while following the requirements of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works ("LACDPW"). Existing on-site drainage patterns and channels would not be significantly altered by the Projects' minimal grading, and all off-site drainage patterns and channels would not be significantly impacted either. Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7 would allow the developments' increase in runoff (up to the 25-year storm event) to be both infiltrated and treated on-site. This also minimizes downstream impacts by returning to predevelopment flow conditions. Therefore, Project 1 will not conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance. **(DEIR at 4.9-38)**.

Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines are not in the vicinity of any SWRCB-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated. During construction, wastewater treatment systems would not be necessary. The Projects would contract services to supply and maintain portable toilets. Therefore, the impacts of Project 1 to the quality of groundwater and surface water would be less than significant during construction. The same portable toilet services would be contracted for operations. Temporary portable toilet services would be delivered during the required maintenance periods on an as needed basis. As a result, there would be less than significant impacts to the water quality of groundwater and surface water during Project 1 operations. **(DEIR at 4.9-39)**.

Project 1 does not involve the construction of housing. Therefore, no housing will be placed within a 100-year flood hazard area, and no impacts are anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-39)**.

Project 1 is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain, or within the immediate vicinity of any levees or dams which would place people or structures at risk of significant loss, injury or death in the event of a failure. In the event of a failure of the aqueduct near Project 1, the distance between the site and the aqueduct would allow the flow to dissipate. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated. The slopes of the Project 1 site are very mild, with slopes of less than 2 percent. Therefore, high mudflow conditions are not anticipated, and any mudflow conditions are expected to have a less than significant impact. Accordingly, Project 1 will not place structures in an area subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow. **(DEIR at 4.9-40)**.

Project 1 impacts related to Hydrology and Water Quality are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

HYDRO-1 Education and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants and Employees. Appropriate educational materials and training for preventing stormwater pollution and additional BMP Fact Sheets from the California Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks can be found at www.cabmphandbooks.com. Practical information material will be provided to employees on general good housekeeping practices. These materials will describe, but are not limited to, spill prevention and control and the use of chemicals, petroleum products, pesticides and fertilizers that should be limited to the property, with no discharge of wastes directly or indirectly to gutters, catch basins or the storm drain system. Information will be distributed directly to the employees as well as being posted in public areas. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities. The required materials shall be available at each project site and a log kept to show education has occurred prior to the start of construction.

HYDRO-2 A spill contingency plan will be prepared by the owner/building operator. As a minimum the Spill Contingency Plan will "mandate the stockpiling of cleanup materials, notification of responsible agencies, disposal of cleanup materials and documentation." This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-3 No hazardous materials are anticipated to be stored on-site. If hazardous materials are required to be stored on-site, a designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in accordance with requirements of the Health & Safety Code and store the materials according to applicable regulations. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-4 A designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in compliance with the current requirements of the County of Los Angeles Fire Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-5 Site waste receptacles shall be emptied on a weekly basis or more often to prevent containers from overflowing. Upon inspection any debris or rubbish will be picked up and the site cleaned. The trash area is NOT to be cleaned by hosing down. The type of materials used to clean the area and storage of said materials will be determined by the Contractor. Signage will be posted that lids shall be kept closed at all times. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 at all times during facility operations.

2.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant effect related to Land Use and Planning if it would: physically divide an established community; be inconsistent with applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to, the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans; be inconsistent with the zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject properties; or conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria.

Finding:

Project 1 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Land Use and Planning. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 1 is located within a sparsely populated area, and is not located within any established community. Project 1 is located in an area that has been characterized by agricultural uses for several decades, and has been in transition to residential uses or vacant land. Project 1 would not physically alter the community, would not divide any community, or change any public access routes to them. Impacts would be considered to be less than significant. Likewise, Project 1's proposed gen-tie lines would not result in physical improvements that would result in dividing an established community, and the proposed gen-tie line would be located within a public right-of-

way or an easement on private land. Therefore, Project 1 would not divide an established community, and impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.10-36)**.

Project 1 is not located within the boundaries of a Community Standards District; therefore, no district development standards apply to Project 1. The Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan designates the Project 1 site as N-1, Non-Urban use. According to the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, allowable uses in the N-1 designation include utility installations (County of Los Angeles 1986). Project 1 is considered a utility installation, and therefore would be consistent with the N-1 land use designation. As a result, Project 1 would be consistent with the General Plan Land Use designation. Development of Project 1 will be consistent with permissible uses associated with the land use designation and the policies, goals, and objectives outlined in the Los Angeles County General Plan and the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, and will not be inconsistent with any applicable County plan. **(DEIR at 4.10-36)**.

The gen-tie lines for Project 1 are linear infrastructure that would not result in any changes to the existing land use patterns in the area of Project 1. The gen-tie lines would be located underground within Los Angeles County to the extent practicable, and aboveground within the City of Lancaster, either in a public road ROW or on private lands adjacent to the public road ROW. Within the City of Lancaster, the gen-tie line routes would traverse land use designations "NU" Residential and "UR" in the City of Lancaster. According to the County's Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, allowable uses in the N-1 designation include utility installations. Additionally, the City's NU land use designation permits solar generating facilities and utility installations within its designation. In July 2013, the City approved a General Plan Amendment for the UR designation to NU designation for another applicant's solar project that the gen-tie line would traverse to connect to the Antelope Substation. A franchise agreement will be obtained by the Applicant with the City of Lancaster for the gen-tie line that will traverse through this jurisdiction. This agreement will grant a utility franchise and right of way privileges for the proposed gen-tie line. Therefore, no impact to County and City Plans would occur**.** Project 1 would not be located within the Fox Airfield's airport influence area. Therefore, this Plan is not applicable to Project 1, and there would be no impacts. **(DEIR at 4.10-37)**.

The County's CUP entitlement process involves the discretionary review of a project, whereby conditions of approval for Project 1 would be assigned. A CUP Burden of Proof is required to be submitted to determine Project 1's consistency with the General Plan, compatibility with surrounding land uses, conditions to ensure compatibility, land suitability and physical constraints, project design, availability of adequate access, public services and facilities to serve the development, and identify potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures. As shown in DEIR Tables 4.10-1, 4.10-2, and 4.10-3, Project 1 is consistent with County land use designations and compatible with adjacent and surrounding land uses. (DEIR at 4.10-43). The implementation of the environmental mitigation measures and CUP conditions would be expected to minimize Project 1's potential impacts, such that the Project could occur while maintaining zoning compliance within the designated zone. As a result, Project 1 would be consistent with the County's zoning designations. Permitting processes for those portions of the gen-tie lines located in the City of Lancaster would require necessary approvals from the City. Compliance with applicable City zoning regulations and conditions would ensure consistency with City's zoning designations. **(DEIR at 4.10-38)**.

Project 1 and lands adjacent to its associated gen-tie line ROW are zoned Light Agriculture (A-1), which does not permit electric generating facilities within this zone. A zone change from A-1 to Heavy Agriculture (A-2) is part of the County approvals. Under the jurisdiction of the County of Los Angeles, electric generating plants and transmission lines are allowed in A-2 zones with issuance of a CUP. The proposed Project 1 gen-tie line would be constructed underground within Los Angeles County unless other applicable regulations require above-ground installation. The gen-tie line would be located on private lands adjacent to the public road ROW or within the public road ROW. It is a linear component that would not result in any changes to the existing land use patterns in the area, and would be permitted as part of the CUP. As discussed above, a CUP for the Project would be required by the County of Los Angeles under the A-2 zoning designation. Therefore, Project 1 and the associated gen-tie line would result in a less than significant impact relative to the subject proposed A-2 zoning in Los Angeles County. **(DEIR at 4.10-38)**.

As discussed in DEIR Section 4.4 Biological Resources, Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines are not located within a designated SEA; therefore, SEA conformance criteria do not apply. Additionally, no local community conservation plans that could contain applicable land use criteria apply to Project 1 or its associated gen-tie lines. Project 1 would not be located within a Hillside Management Area, and would not conflict with any Hillside Management criteria. **(DEIR at 4.10-39)**.

Project 1 is located within an Agricultural Opportunity Area, as discussed in Section 4.2 of the DEIR. Project 1 would generate electrical power through renewable solar PV technology which is an allowable use with a CUP and where necessary, a zone change. Project 1 would involve conversion of land that was formerly used for agricultural production to renewable energy production. Construction and operation of Project 1 would not involve other restrictions, obstructions, or resources that could result in conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use. Additionally, Project 1 would be located on fallow land that is currently not irrigated, with surrounding parcels being mostly undeveloped and fallow agricultural land. Project 1 would produce power in a passive manner and would result in minimal air emissions, traffic, and noise, and would not affect adjacent agricultural operations. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(DEIR at 4.10-40)**.

Project 1 contains no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as discussed in DEIR Section 4.2 Agriculture and Forestry. Therefore, Project 1 will have no impact to Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. **(DEIR at 4.10-40)**. Project 1 is not located within a Noise Management Area. **(DEIR at 4.10-41)**.

Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines are located within the 500-year floodplain Zone X (Unshaded). These areas are known to be of a very low flood risk. All of the Project 1 area would be developed, and measures would be taken in the design of the site's solar panels to account for the flood hazards. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(DEIR at 4.10-41)**.

2.11 NOISE

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant Noise impact if it would: result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the project; result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; for a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels; or, for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Noise.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Sound generated from Project 1 would consist of: (1) short duration sounds resulting from construction activities, and (2) sound during normal facility operations. Vibration from Project 1 would only result during construction. Construction activities would take place only during daytime hours. An evaluation of expected noise and vibration levels was performed, and the ability of Project 1 to comply with applicable noise requirements was assessed.

For Project 1, the following criteria were determined to be inapplicable or to result in no impact:

- Exposure of on-site workers to noise levels that exceed occupational safety standards (90 dBA as a time-weighted 8-hour average or peak noise levels above 115 dBA).

- Exposure of residents to airport or private airstrip-related noise levels above a CNEL of 65 dBA.

Occupational noise exposure is governed by federal and state regulations. Cal/OSHA administers industrial safety regulations in California. Cal/OSHA regulations establish a time-weighted noise exposure limit of 90 dBA averaged over 8 hours (CCR, Title 8, Article 105). Noise source controls, administrative procedures, or worker hearing protection must be provided if worker noise exposure would exceed the 90 dBA limit. The construction contractor selected for the Project would be required to follow Cal/OSHA requirements for construction worker noise exposure. **(DEIR at 4.11-25)**.

Project 1 construction would take place between the third quarter of 2014 and the second quarter of 2015. Sound from construction equipment would vary dependent on the construction phase and the number and class of equipment at a location at any given time. **(DEIR at 4.11-26)**. Prior to commencement of construction, Project 1 will be required to obtain a variance from the County's noise ordinance (as described under Section 12.08 of the Los Angeles County Code), because the pile driving will last for more than ten days. Generally, construction sound would attenuate with increased distance from the sound sources. Actual received sound levels would fluctuate, depending on the construction activity, equipment type, and separation distances between source and receiver. Construction noise is a temporary noise source that would only occur during daytime hours. Sound levels from construction are expected to be comparable to sound produced by farm machinery, such as equipment used in nearby agricultural fields. Worst case construction noise levels for the nearest residence would last no more than a few weeks, as construction activities progress across Project 1. Therefore, no one residence would be exposed to significant noise levels for any extended period of time. **(DEIR at 4.11-27)**.

Traffic noise generated during construction of Project 1 on and offsite would temporarily add to overall sound levels. As a general construction practice, functional mufflers would be maintained on all equipment to maintain noise levels as low as reasonably achievable. The Project 1 Applicant would make reasonable efforts to minimize noise resulting from construction activities, as described in Mitigation Measures N1- N6. With implementation of these measures, including the use of sound curtains or barriers during pile driving, construction sound levels would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.11-27)**.

Like noise from pile driving, vibration from pile driving would only last for a few weeks at most, and would move throughout the Project rapidly with no single noise sensitive receptor experiencing the peak 0.04 PPV for more than an few hours, and would not damage structures. Therefore, exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels due to the construction of Project 1 and the gen-tie line will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.11-48)**.

Little Buttes Antique Airfield is two miles from Project 1, and Skyotee Ranch Airport is located 4.6 miles from Project 1. Both have very low use levels. No airfield noise contours have been developed for Little Buttes Antique Airfield and Skyotee Ranch Airport, but due to low operation levels and distance from the airports, sound levels at both airfields are assumed to be below 55 dBA CNEL. Project 1 would not create residential land uses, and all Project features are outside the airfield properties. Consequently, there are no impacts from airport-related noise. **(DEIR at 4.11-51)**.

Project 1 impacts related to Noise are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

N-1 Construction operations would not occur between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday, or at any time on Sunday with the exception of limited low-noise generating potential night work with Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning and Public Works approval.

N-2 Construction site and access road maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour shall be established and enforced during the construction period.

N-3 Electrically-powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, except for devices like trucks, loaders, dozers, and other heavy equipment.

N-4 Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far as practicable, and no closer than 1,000 feet, from noise-sensitive receptors.

N-5 The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells are prohibited except where required by OSHA or for safety or emergency warning purposes required by other regulatory agencies.

N-6 Project-related public address or music systems used on-site shall not be audible at any adjacent receptor.

N-7 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 which are in compliance with any applicable legally required equipment noise standards. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors) shall be equipped with shrouds and/or other noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment. Mobile sound barriers with a sound transmission class of 19 or greater will be used for pile driving on Projects where received sound levels at the nearest noise sensitive receptor are predicted to be above the County construction noise limit of 60 dBA during the day. With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may need to incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including:

N-8 Siting substations to achieve National Electrical Manufacturers Association ("NEMA") sound ratings at sensitive receptors as described in Section 4.11.5.2 not to be closer to the property line of sensitive receptors than the following distances for each individual project:

- Project 1 – 325 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 74 dBA

N-9 The Applicant shall use NEMA low noise rated transformer equipment which will achieve 10 dBA or greater noise reduction as compared to standard NEMA-rated transformers of a similar size and rated capacity to ensure that Project noise impacts would be less than significant.

2.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant impact on Public Services if it would create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection; sheriff protection; schools; parks; libraries, or other public facilities.

Finding:

Project 1 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Public Services. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 1 is located within the LACFD Battalion 11 service area. Station 112, which is 3.8 miles southeast of Project 1, is the jurisdictional station (i.e. the first-responder) to respond to incidents at the site. Additional fire stations within Battalion 11 (identified in Table 4.12-1) would also potentially be dispatched to respond to fire protection needs at the site.

During construction, workers would be temporary and would not be expected to relocate to the Project 1 area as they would mostly be hired from the available local workforce and would not be expected to result in significant changes to the local population; therefore, the construction of Project 1 is not anticipated to create significant changes to the local population that would increase the level of demand on fire protection services or that would increase the level of demand on the fire department services such that additional staff would be needed. **(DEIR at 4.12-6)**.

As discussed in DEIR Section 4.13, Transportation and Traffic, construction of Project 1 would not result in significant traffic impacts. However, Project 1 would involve construction of an underground 0.54-mile gen-tie line along West Avenue B and an underground 0.02 mile gen-tie across 110th Street West. Transmission line construction would require work in the public road ROW, including limited encroachment into the traveled roadway. It is anticipated that the construction of the Project 1 gen-tie lines would only require partial street closures, which provide better emergency access than full street closures. Approvals for Project 1 will require worksite traffic control plans, permits, and coordination with County departments regarding potential construction impacts to West Avenue B and 110th Street West. Additionally, the LACFD Fire Stations 112, 130, and 78 would be notified at a minimum of three days in advance of any street closures that may affect fire/paramedic responses in the area. In the event that the Project 1 gen-tie line construction would require road closures, alternate route details (detour plans) and the schedule of closures would be submitted to the LACFD prior to construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TT-3 would minimize potential effects to West Avenue B and 110th Street West, such that the impact to LACFD access and response times would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-6)**.

Based on the Applicant's commitment to conformance of construction activities at the Project 1 site and gen-tie line ROW to federal, state, and Los Angeles County ordinances for fire protection, and implementation of mitigation related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials, construction would not be expected to result in significant special fire problems or hazards. Additionally, construction traffic at the site would not be anticipated to have a significant impact on local intersections and road segments. Therefore, Project 1 impacts to LACFD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-6)**.

Operations activities at Project 1 would typically be associated with routine maintenance carried out on-site and along the associated gen-tie ROWs at periodic intervals by a small maintenance crew. These activities would not result in effects to LACFD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection during operations of Project 1; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. In addition, the Applicant would be required to pay taxes as per the Proposition E Special Tax and property tax assessments, which are allocated to the LACFD. These taxes are designed to provide for potential increases in LACFD fire protection service demands to accommodate for new and existing developments. **(DEIR at 4.12-11).**

The Project 1 site is located within the LACSD Field Operations Region 1 service area. The Lancaster Station, which is approximately 12.4 miles southeast of Project 1, would likely be the first responder to incidents at the site. Currently the station maintains an officer-to-population service ratio of approximately 1 to 1,000. Project 1 does not involve any residential uses, and would not be considered to result in significant increases to population. During construction, workers would be temporary, and would not be expected to relocate to the area as they would mostly be hired from the available local workforce. The employees are planned to be hired from the available local workforce, and would not be expected to result in significant changes to the local population that would increase the level of demand on law enforcement services. **(DEIR at 4.12-11)**.

Sheriff services potentially required at Project 1 would likely include incidents of vandalism or theft. While these incidents would require sheriff services, they are not considered emergency response incidents, and as such would not affect emergency response times. As discussed in DEIR Section 4.13, Transportation and Traffic, construction of Project 1 would not result in significant traffic impacts. However, Project 1 would involve construction of an underground 0.5-mile gen-tie line on West Avenue B and an underground 0.02 mile gen-tie across 110th Street West, which may require work in the public road ROW, and may potentially encroach into the traveled roadway. As a result, it is proposed to require worksite traffic control plans, permits, and coordination with County departments regarding potential construction impacts to West Avenue B and 110th Street West. Implementation of this would be expected to minimize potential effects to West Avenue B and 110th Street West such that the impact to LACSD access and response times would be less than significant. As a result, construction of Project 1 would be expected to result in less than significant effects to LACSD services and response times, such that Project 1 would not require additional LACSD staffing. Therefore, impacts from the construction of Project 1 to LACSD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for sheriff protection would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-11)**. Likewise, impacts to LACFD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for sheriff

protection during operations of Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines are expected to be negligible. **(DEIR at 4.12-15)**.

Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines do not include residential development or the influx of long-term workers from outside the area, and accordingly would not generate population growth. Consequently, no new demands on school facilities, parks, library facilities or other public facilities are expected, and no impact would occur to these facilities. **(DEIR at 4.12-15; 4.12-16)**.

2.13 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant impact on Transportation and Traffic if it would: conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit; 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; result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks; substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); result in inadequate emergency access; or conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Transportation and Traffic.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Traffic generated during the construction phase of Project 1 and its gen-tie line would include construction worker commuter trips, water truck trips, and delivery truck trips. Construction worker commuter trips and delivery truck trips are anticipated to arrive to the Project 1 site outside of peak hours. It is anticipated that 30 percent of water trucks would arrive to the Project site during the AM peak hour. Project 1 would have an average of 75 workers per day and a peak of 100 workers per day over a 20-day period during construction. For equipment and materials, Project 1 would have an average of 4 delivery truck trips per day with an expected peak of 26 delivery truck trips. It is anticipated that construction workers and delivery trucks would arrive to the Project 1 site outside of peak hours. **(DEIR at 4.13-28)**.

Dependent upon climatic conditions during construction, the maximum estimated water use for the Project 1 site is 50 acre-feet for Phase 1, and 50 acre-feet for Phase 2, which would be

obtained from an off-site provider. Potable water would be brought in to the Project 1 site for drinking and domestic needs. During the site preparation and site preparation activities, water would mainly be used for soil compaction and control of fugitive dust generation. Smaller quantities of water would also be required on an as-needed basis for preparation of the concrete required for foundations and other minor uses. Subsequent to these construction activities, water usage would primarily be used for on-going dust suppression associated with the remaining construction of Project 1. Project 1 would require a total of 10 daily water truck trips arriving on-site. Assuming that 30 percent of the water trucks would arrive on-site during the AM peak hour (7:00 AM), 3 water trucks would be used in this analysis. As shown in DEIR Tables 4.13-13 and 4.13-14, during the AM peak hour the local roads would experience a maximum increase in traffic volume of 18.75 percent. This is mainly due to the existing low volume and low peak traffic conditions for these roads, which are located in rural areas and operate well below the existing capacity of 1,600 vehicles per lane per hour for a 2-lane road. Therefore, these roads have adequate capacity to safely accommodate the increase from Project 1 water truck traffic, and would have a less than significant impact on the existing traffic conditions. **(DEIR at 4.13-28)**.

During construction of gen-tie lines associated with Project 1, it is anticipated that temporary, one-lane road closures would be necessary. A Project Traffic Plan would be prepared to address the temporary one-lane road closures and submitted to the County for approval prior to issuance/approval of the County Grading Permit as indicated in Mitigation Measure TT-2. Parking, temporary office trailers, and construction and PV equipment lay-down areas would be located entirely within the Project 1 site boundary. The construction impacts would be temporary and less than significant with mitigation. **(DEIR at 4.13-29)**.

The operational phase of Project 1 is anticipated to only generate an average of 2 additional vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hours on a quarterly or as-needed basis with a maximum of 10 additional trips, which would only occur when panel washing operations are being conducted. Based on the traffic analysis for the water truck trips described above, the operational phase vehicle trips are considered negligible. Therefore, no additional post-construction operational analysis was conducted. The operational phase of Project 1 would have a less than significant impact on the traffic and/or transportation infrastructure. **(DEIR at 4.13-29)**. Project 1 would not conflict with any applicable congestion management programs during the construction or operational phases. **(DEIR at 4.13-39)**.

Air traffic would not be impacted by implementation of Project 1. Project 1 would not include any buildings, structures, or other operations that would result in a change in existing air traffic patterns. The PV modules that would be used at Project 1 would be non-reflective, and would not pose a hazard to air traffic. Gen-tie line components would be below the height limit and would not result in a change in existing air traffic patterns. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.13-39)**.

No existing roads would be altered by Project 1, and Project 1 does not include design features or uses that would substantially increase any hazards. Parking, temporary office trailers, and construction and PV equipment lay-down areas would be located entirely within the Project 1 site boundary. Only temporary one-lane road closures are expected for the construction of the Gen-tie Lines. A Project Traffic Plan would be prepared to address the temporary one-lane road

closures and submitted to the County for approval prior to issuance/approval of the Grading Permit. Therefore, Project 1 would not result in inadequate emergency access. Project 1 is located in rural areas of Los Angeles County and would not significantly decrease the performance or safety of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. **(DEIR at 4.13-40)**.

Project 1 impacts related to Transportation and Traffic are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

TT-1 Prior to issuance of a grading permit, Applicant shall document and submit all required information and/or material pertaining to the pavement conditions of construction routes for the Projects, including the formula for calculation of the Projects' fair share of any repair or reconstruction of construction routes to the satisfaction of LACDPW. Applicant shall reimburse the County of Los Angeles for the cost of any repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes attributable to the Projects as agreed to by LACDPW. The timing of any necessary repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes and the required payment by the Applicant shall be determined by LACDPW.

TT-2 Prior to any construction activities and/or issuance of required encroachment permits from Los Angeles County, the Applicant shall prepare worksite traffic control plans for review and approval from LACDPW and other affected agencies for any closures, partial closures of public streets, or work within or adjacent to the road right-of-way that impacts the movement of traffic. The Plans shall be prepared in accordance with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (2012).

TT-3 Additionally, the County, including LACFD Fire Stations 78 (for R2011-00801) and 130 (for R2011-000798, 00799, 00805,00807, & 00833) shall be notified at least three days in advance of any street closures that may affect fire and/or paramedic responses in the area. The Applicant shall provide alternate route (detour) plans to the County, including three sets to LACFD, with a tentative schedule of planned closures, prior to the beginning of construction.

TT-4 Stagger construction work shifts before or after peak traffic hours.

TT-5 Schedule truck deliveries during off peak hours.

TT-6 Limit water truck deliveries during the AM peak hour to 30 percent of the daily water truck trips. All other trips shall be at off peak hours.

TT-7 Prior to start of construction activities, Applicant shall provide worker education encouraging carpooling and vanpooling by workers and shall provide assistance for organizing vanpools and carpools. A log will be developed to show compliance.

2.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Potential Effect:

Project 1 would have a significant impact on Utilities and Service Systems if it would: exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards; create water or wastewater system capacity problems, 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; create drainage system capacity problems, 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; not have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses; create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; or create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Finding:

Project 1 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Utilities and Service Systems. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The construction of Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines would generate temporary and limited wastewater as a result of on-site construction workers. The wastewater generated would be collected at the on-site mobile sanitation facilities and then transported to a nearby wastewater disposal facility. In the event that additional wastewater is generated from construction activities, water would be stored in an on-site tank system and would be disposed of at an approved wastewater treatment facility. Construction and operational wastewater will be limited in quantity and significantly below wastewater treatment requirements of Los Angeles County and the RWQCB. **(DEIR at 4.14-14)**.

All wastewater would be treated according to the treatment requirements enforced by the NPDES permit authorized by the Lahonton Regional Water Quality Control Board ("LRWQCB"). Additionally, semi-annual washing of the PV modules would generate minimal wastewater during operation. However, since the wash water would only consist of demineralized water and dust washed off of the modules, it would not need to be treated at a wastewater treatment facility. This wash water would be allowed to infiltrate into the ground and evaporate as it drips off the PV modules. The wastewater generated from maintenance workers would be collected at the on-site temporary mobile sanitation facilities and then transported to a nearby wastewater treatment facility. Project 1 would not exceed the requirements of LRWQCB,

and therefore impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-14)**. Likewise, construction and operation of Project 1 would not exceed the capacity of any treatment plant and would have no impact to a wastewater system. Consequently, no new wastewater treatment facilities would need to be created and no existing facilities would need to be expanded. The maximum construction water use of Project 1 is 100 acre feet, and the maximum operational water use of Project 1 is 2.9 acre feet per year. No water system capacity problems would be created and no new water systems or expansion of existing systems would be required. **(DEIR at 4.14-15)**.

Project Site 1 currently drains from west to east; the post-development condition would maintain this flow path. A SWPPP incorporating BMPs for temporary stormwater management would be prepared and approved before the construction of Project 1 and its gen-tie lines. The final design of Project 1 would allow the pre-development runoff amount to continue to sheet flow in the post-development condition to avoid disturbance to downstream drainage structures or wildlife. The design of Project 1 would eliminate the need for new drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, Project 1 would have a less than significant impact on drainage facilities. **(DEIR at 4.14-18)**.

The construction for Project 1 and the Project 1 gen-tie lines would create a short-term temporary demand for water, primarily in association with dust control. The Applicant would provide a Dust Control Plan to the County prior to the start of construction activities. The plan would detail site-specific dust control measures designed to minimize water use during construction activities, while minimizing fugitive dust emissions. Project 1's maximum construction water use is 100 ac-ft, which is estimated for the span of approximately 5 months. The Project 1 site would have otherwise potentially required at least 624 ac-ft of water per year for agricultural use. Based on potential estimated historic groundwater use at the site, there may be adequate groundwater supply within the western portion of the Basin to meet Project 1's construction water needs. In addition, according to the Antelope Valley Integrated Regional Water Management Plan ("IRWMP"), groundwater is considered a reliable water source in the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin.

However, given that the Adjudication will not likely be resolved during construction of Project 1, water for Project 1 would be supplied via truck from either Homer LLC, or the City of Lancaster, both of which have provided "Will Serve" letters indicating their ability to meet the water demands of Project 1. Homer LLC would provide out-of- Basin water stored in the Antelope Valley Water Bank. Potential recycled water providers are Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40, Los Angeles County Sanitation District, and Palmdale Water District. The City of Lancaster has a current supply capacity of approximately 16 million gallons per day of treated wastewater that is suitable for construction use and panel washing. **(Final EIR at p. 256)**.

As previously discussed, the potential estimated historical agricultural water usage for the Project 1 site was determined to be at least 624 AFY. Project 1's maximum construction water use is 100 ac-ft over an approximately 5-month construction period, which equates to 92 percent less than the potential estimated historical annual agricultural groundwater usage at the site. Either of the sources noted above would have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the Project 1 construction demands from existing water source entitlements and water resources.

Therefore the impacts from water usage during construction would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-20)**.

During operations, the maximum water use for Project 1 would be 2.9 AFY. A maximum of 2.9 AFY of additional water may be needed in the first 2 years of operation to establish the plants for the landscaping buffer. It is unlikely but possible that additional water (up to 3 AFY) may be needed later during the operations phase for supplemental plantings if landscape vegetation expires and has to be replaced. As with the Project 1 water needs during construction, during operations Homer LLC would also provide out-of-Basin water stored in the Antelope Valley Water Bank. This option would provide a reliable source of water for operations. Potential recycled water providers are Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40, Los Angeles County Sanitation District, and Palmdale Water District. The City of Lancaster has a current supply capacity of approximately 16 million gallons per day of treated wastewater that is suitable for construction use and panel washing. **(Final EIR at p. 256)**. Therefore, the impacts from water usage during operations would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-20)**.

Project 1 and its associated gen-tie lines do not require natural gas or propane during construction or operation; therefore there would be no system capacity problems for those utilities. Since natural gas and propane are not needed for Project 1, no new energy facilities would need to be created, and no existing facilities would need to be expanded. Project 1 may require electricity for the construction equipment and for lighting construction activities. The electricity would likely come from one of the existing SCE lines located on the west and south sides of the site. Electricity consumption during construction would be temporary, and would vary depending on the phase of construction. Overall, the construction of Project 1 would require limited electrical consumption that the existing electrical grid has capacity to serve. Therefore, Project 1 would have a less than significant impact on energy utility system capacity during construction. **(DEIR at 4.14-25)**.

Project 1 would also require electricity for ongoing maintenance operations, lighting, security systems, and other various operational needs. During daylight hours, the electricity needs for Project 1 would be supplied by Project 1's electricity generation. During non-daylight hours, the electricity needs for Project 1 would be provided by either backfeed from the electrical grid, through the proposed gen-tie, or through the existing SCE lines located on the west and south sides of the Project 1 site. Therefore, Project 1 would have a less than significant impact on energy utility system capacity. **(DEIR at 4.14-26)**.

Construction of Project 1 would require some earthwork, demolition of two existing buildings, removal of a broken-down structure, and installation of the SGF. Solid waste generated from construction of Project 1 and the Project 1 gen-tie lines may include paper, wood, glass, plastics from packing material, waste lumber, insulation, scrap metal and concrete, empty nonhazardous containers, and vegetation wastes. In accordance with Title 22 Chapter 22.52, 65 percent of construction and demolition debris would be recycled. Any material that cannot be recycled would be properly disposed of at a regional disposal facility. Any defective or broken solar modules would be returned to the manufacturer for recycling or recycled by the Applicant as possible. In accordance with Title 22 Chapter 20.87, the Applicant would prepare a Recycling

and Reuse Plan and progress reports to implement and document the Project's recycling practices. Therefore, Project 1 impacts on landfill and solid waste disposal capacity will be less than significant. Once the SGF is installed, there would be minimal waste generated during operations of Project 1, therefore Project 1 impacts on landfill and solid waste disposal capacity would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-26)**.

Non-hazardous waste generated during construction, operation, and decommissioning of Project 1 (and gen-tie lines) would be transferred by licensed waste hauling contractors and recycled or disposed of in compliance with local and state regulations. Hazardous wastes would be shipped offsite and treated or disposed in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations for hazardous waste management. The construction contractor would prepare a Project-specific hazardous materials management and hazardous waste management program for Project 1. Project 1 would have no impact relative to compliance with existing federal or state regulations pertaining to solid waste, because Project 1 would be required to comply with all relevant regulations during construction, operation and decommissioning. **(DEIR at 4.14-27)**.

SECTION 3.0 FINDINGS REGARDING CUMULATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH ARE NOT SIGNIFICANT OR WHICH HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

Pursuant to Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines, the following findings and statements of fact identify potentially significant cumulative impacts and Project 1's incremental contribution to the impacts discussed in the Final EIR, in the context of the other five Projects and other cumulative projects. For the following environmental resource areas, Project 1's incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable, and no cumulatively significant impact will occur.

3.1 AESTHETICS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Aesthetics.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects. Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Aesthetics.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Individually, with mitigation, each of the six proposed SGF Projects can each be expected to have a less than significant impact on aesthetic resources. The Project sites comprise 987.1 acres, or 0.6 percent of the total area within the 5 mile radius. Within the 5-mile radius area, there are 20,909 acres of development listed by individual projects, as shown in DEIR Table 3-7. These

development projects, including the Applicant's Projects, comprise 12.6 percent of the area identified in DEIR Figure 3-5 and include solar projects, commercial projects, and residential projects.

From elevated viewpoints, the western Antelope Valley appears as a mosaic of agricultural lands, suburban developments, and open land. From a distance, the proposed SGFs would not appear dissimilar to agricultural fields or existing PV facilities in shape and size. The other solar and real estate developments proposed for the western Antelope Valley would not appear dissimilar to existing land use patterns. From level viewpoints, such as those along local roads, solar or residential/commercial developments would not be prominent unless the observer is directly adjacent to the facility. Because of the flat nature of the Antelope Valley landscape, developments would quickly become less prominent as the viewer travels away from them. In addition, the scenic character on the valley floor is generally low. Existing commercial, residential, and energy developments (including substations, high-voltage transmission lines, distribution lines, and generation facilities) are scattered throughout the valley.

A 12.6 percent level of increase in development within 5 miles of each of the Project sites is not anticipated to be significant from elevated or level viewpoints, because the proposed developments would appear similar to existing developments in the Antelope Valley, and cover only a very small portion of the land within 5 miles of each proposed Project site. Views of open desert lands would still exist, and the flatness of the landscape would limit the prominence of new developments with increasing distance.

The proposed Projects and other proposed projects within the cumulative impacts study area would be individually required to comply with the Los Angeles County General Plan goals and policies, and the Antelope Valley Area Plan policies, as well as applicable ordinances such as the Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance, as they are applicable to aesthetic resources, as identified in Section 4.1.3 of the DEIR. Any cumulative aesthetic impacts would be reduced to a level that is less than significant with mitigation by application of these regulations, and mitigation measures A-1 to A-5. **(DEIR at 4.1-114 to 4.1-115)**.

3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Cumulative impacts to Agriculture and Forestry Resources could occur in the event that Project 1, in conjunction with the six proposed SGF Projects and other cumulative projects results in the area results in a cumulatively significant loss of Important Farmlands or Williamson Act contracted lands.

Finding:

Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Agriculture and Forestry Resources. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see DEIR Table 3-7). For the purposes of this cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable law ordinances regulations and standards.

Projects 1 – 6 are located in a region with significant agricultural uses. However, the Antelope Valley has been historically and is currently limited by water costs and climate conditions. Cumulatively, the Projects would not develop land classified as Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Project 4 is the only site that currently contains land designated as Prime Farmland and of Statewide Importance. As mentioned above, the DOC is in process of reclassifying Project 4 land currently mapped as Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance to Grazing Land on the 2012 edition of the Important Farmland Map for Los Angeles County. The Projects would not be expected to contribute to the overall trend of conversion of agricultural lands to other uses in the Antelope Valley when considered together with other potential cumulative projects in the area. That said, it is contemplated that at the end of the anticipated 35-year life of Projects 1-6, the associated properties could be returned to agricultural use. The Projects' incremental contribution to cumulative agricultural impacts is considered less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-9)**.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Air Quality.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Air Quality. Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Air Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Twenty-nine related projects have been identified within the proposed Projects' vicinity; locations are listed in DEIR Figure 4.3-2, "Cumulative Projects in the Region". Of these 29 related projects, there are a number of related projects that have not yet been built or are currently under construction. Since the Applicant has no control over the timing or sequencing of the related projects, and the level of emissions that would be generated by the related projects is uncertain, it is infeasible and speculative to prepare a quantitative analysis to ascertain daily construction emissions that would occur under a worst-case scenario of all 29 related projects being constructed concurrently with the Applicant's six Projects.

For this reason, the AVAQMD was consulted to assess the cumulative impact resulting only from the Applicant's six Projects. The County's EIR consultant (Tetra Tech) met with AVAQMD officials and technical staff at the AVAQMD's office on May 29, 2012, and discussed the proper cumulative Air Quality analysis methodology for the Project pursuant to CEQA. **(DEIR at 4.3-48)**. AVAQMD determined that cumulative impacts from the Applicant's six Projects should be cumulatively quantified based on size, construction equipment per phase, and construction phase duration, and that the related projects should only be qualitatively discussed within the EIR. The cumulative Air Quality analysis was performed based on the direction from AVAQMD, and included the analysis of concurrent construction and operation emissions sources on any one maximum construction day, air dispersion modeling method, and risk assessment method. **(DEIR at 4.3-48)**.

As previously discussed in the analyses above (DEIR Table 4.3-13, "Peak Annual Construction Emissions"; DEIR Table 4.3-20, "Peak Annual Operation Emissions"; and DEIR Table 4.3-22, "Concurrent Health Risk Assessment"), emissions from overlapping construction phases of the Applicant's six projects would not exceed the AVAQMD thresholds on any maximum day or year during construction or operations. **(DEIR 4.3-30; 4.3-49)**.

With respect to the Project's construction-period air quality emissions and cumulative Basin-wide conditions, the AVAQMD has developed strategies to reduce criteria pollutant emissions outlined in the Air Quality Management Plan ("AQMP") pursuant to CAA mandates. As such, Project 1 would comply with AVAQMD Rule 403 requirements, and implement all feasible mitigation measures. In addition, Project 1 would comply with adopted AQMP emissions control measures. Per AVAQMD rules and mandates and the CEQA requirement that significant impacts be mitigated to the extent feasible, these same requirements (i.e., Rule 403 compliance, the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, and compliance with adopted AQMP emissions control measures) would also be imposed on construction projects Basin-wide, which would include each of the related projects mentioned below. **(DEIR 4.3-49)**.

By applying AVAQMD's cumulative air quality impact methodology, implementation of Projects 1 – 6 would not result in an addition of pollutants, such that considerable cumulative impacts in conjunction with related projects in the region would occur. Therefore, the emissions of nonattainment pollutants and precursors generated cumulatively by Projects 1 – 6 would be less than significant. Projects are deemed inconsistent with air quality plans when they result in population and/or employment growth that exceeds growth estimates in the applicable air quality plan. The SGF sites would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, which in this case is the Federal 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan (Western Mojave Desert Nonattainment Area). The Ozone Attainment Plan relies upon future year emission inventories consistent with California Air Resource Board ("CARB") and the adopted General Plan growth projections. As the proposed Projects are not part of an ongoing regulatory program, the AVAQMD recommends Project-specific air quality impacts be used to determine the potential cumulative impacts to regional air quality. As discussed above, peak daily emissions of operation-related pollutants would not exceed AVAQMD significance thresholds.

The combined Projects' emission estimates state that while Projects 1 – 6 would generate air emissions during construction and a minimal amount of GHG emissions during operations, the

Projects' incremental contribution, with mitigation, to cumulative air quality impacts do not exceed any air quality significance thresholds and would comply with the applicable AVAQMD AQMP. It should be noted that solar energy provided by the Projects is a much cleaner source of energy than traditional sources used for the generation of electricity, such as the burning of coal, fuel oil, or natural gas. Furthermore, since the percentage of GHG emissions generated by Projects 1 – 6 is so small; Projects 1 – 6 would provide a *de minimis* contribution to significant cumulative impacts caused by other projects in the region (as further discussed in DEIR Section 4.7, Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas). The Projects' emissions of non-attainment pollutants and precursors generated during operations with mitigation would not exceed the AVAQMD Project-level thresholds and are less than significant. As a result, Project-level emissions would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution, such that results in an increase in air pollutant emissions above those assumed in the regional AQMP. **(DEIR at 4.3-52)**.

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Biological Resources.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Biological Resources. Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Biological Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The total area included in the map in DEIR Figure 3-17 showing a 5.0 mile radius outward from each of the Project 1 – 6 solar sites comprises 165,349 acres. Solar development in the area is 8,086 acres (4.9 percent of the 165,349 acres shown in DEIR Figure 3-17). The Silverado Projects cover 987 acres (only 0.6 percent of the total area). Open space and wildlife mitigation lands would be acquired and preserved in perpetuity for Projects 1 – 6. Since the mitigation lands are intended to comprise higher quality wildlife habitat than those impacted by the Projects, impacts will be mitigated. The permanent nature of the land mitigation and preservation program to be implemented would assure that these new wildlife habitat mitigation lands would always be maintained and enhanced for wildlife values. Therefore, cumulative impacts from the Project would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.4-71)**.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Cultural Resources.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Cultural Resources. Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Cultural Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. As described above under impacts specific to Project 1, impacts related to cultural resources would be mitigated to less than significant levels, since the CRHR and NRHP eligible resources in the area would be avoided. Because impacts to cultural resources would be mitigated to less than significant through avoidance, Projects 1 – 6 would not result in an incremental increase in effects on cultural resources when combined with the other 29 projects. Therefore, no significant cumulative impacts would be expected to occur. **(DEIR at 4.5-35)**.

3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Geology and Soils.

Finding:

Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Geology and Soils. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). For the purposes of this

cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time.

It is assumed that construction of all of the cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards, and that geotechnical studies would be performed to assess and mitigate any geotechnical hazards associated with them; therefore, the cumulative projects would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects. It is also assumed that the cumulative projects would comply with all applicable erosion control and stormwater management laws, ordinances, regulations and standards, therefore the construction of the cumulative projects would not contribute to cumulative soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

Proposed Projects 1 – 6 would not expose the public to adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking because the Projects would be contained within a secure fenced area at each location and not open to the public. The potential for injury to workers is also quite low as they will not be on-site the majority of the time, and the likelihood that a seismic event would occur when workers are present is quite small. The Projects would also not result in significant soil erosion because the design and construction of the Projects' facilities would comply with all applicable building codes and standards established by regulatory agencies, including Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the CBC. The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would therefore not contribute incrementally to cumulative impacts resulting from other development within the 5-mile radius. **(DEIR at 4.6-27)**.

3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change. Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15355, a "cumulative impact" is an environmental effect that may result from the combination of two or more environmental effects associated with a proposed project, or from the combination of one or more project environmental effects with related environmental effects caused by other closely related projects. However, in the case of global climate change, the proximity of the Projects to other GHG-generating activities is not directly relevant to the determination of a cumulative impact. Although AB 32 sets statewide

targets for future GHG emissions, the scoping plan and other implementing tools of the law are clear that the reductions are not expected to occur uniformly from all sources or sectors. The conclusions related specifically to Project 1, above, highlights the manner by which the proposed Projects intend to meet many of these strategies.

Numerous options exist for project developers to reduce their contribution to city-, county-, and state-wide GHG emissions, while helping to meet the region's future housing, jobs, and infrastructure needs. However, it is not possible at this time to accurately quantify GHG emissions expected from the related Projects or the GHG reductions anticipated from the above-listed strategies. There is no certain basis for concluding that an emissions increase resulting from the Projects and the related Projects could cause a measurable increase in global GHG emissions sufficient to force global climate change due to the complex physical, chemical and atmospheric mechanisms involved in global climate change.

In addition, the emissions models used for Project-level evaluations do not fully reflect improvements in technology and other reductions in GHG emissions that are likely to occur pursuant to state regulations, such as AB 1493, SB 1368, AB 32, and Executive Order S-3-5, as well as future federal and/or state regulations. Therefore, it is not possible or meaningful to calculate emissions from each of the identified related Projects and compare that with a numeric threshold or reduction target. Projects 1-6 would be consistent with the state's goals in helping the state meet the RPS (DEIR Table 4.7-17), resulting in a GHG emission profile that is below established thresholds, and include implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-1 to GHG-5. Therefore, the Projects do not contribute considerably to cumulatively significant global climate change impacts. **(DEIR at 4.7-31)**.

3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see Table 3-7). For the purposes of this cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with

all laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. It is assumed that for each of the cumulative projects, Hazardous Materials Management Plans and Hazardous Waste Management Plans would be implemented, a SWPPP would be prepared, and all applicable environmental due diligence would be conducted (i.e., a Phase I ESA). If any of the cumulative projects are within an airport land use plan or airport influence area, the projects would obtain the appropriate authorizations and permitting from the respective Airport Land Use Commission. The cumulative projects would have a less than significant impact with mitigation to hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the land uses in the surrounding areas (primarily agricultural) and the limited amount and type of hazardous materials to be used as part of the proposed Projects 1 – 6, no significant incremental cumulative impacts associated with environmental safety are expected to occur as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed Projects 1 – 6. Regulations implemented by the Department of Toxic Substance Control ("DTSC"), LACSD, LACFD, and Cal/OSHA would require similar measures be applied to other developments in the region. Therefore, Projects 1 – 6 are not expected to result in significant incremental cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. **(DEIR at 4.8-19 to 4.8-20)**.

3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Hydrology and Water Quality. Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Project sites, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-3). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws ordinances regulations and standards. Projects located within 5 miles of the proposed Projects entail the geographic extent under consideration of cumulative impacts. The proposed Projects are six of several proposed renewable development projects that would impact existing and proposed land uses within the general Project area. As shown in DEIR Table 3-7 and DEIR Figure 3-17, the proposed Projects would entail approximately 0.60 percent of all proposed projects within a 5-mile radius.

All cumulative projects that may be approved and implemented would also assess potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality. The proposed Projects 1 – 6 were found to have less than significant impacts related to erosion, flooding, debris deposition, and stormwater quality, with no off-site impacts. Additionally, the proposed Projects would not result in any significant or unavoidable impacts and represent a small fraction of the total amount of lands affected by renewable projects and foreseeable projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects. Therefore, the proposed Projects would not be expected to significantly contribute to potential cumulative impacts associated with other projects in the Projects' region. **(DEIR at 4.9-45)**.

3.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Land Use and Planning.

Finding:

Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Land Use and Planning. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6. The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards. **(DEIR at 4.10-43)**.

Projects located within 5 miles of the proposed Projects entail the geographic extent under consideration of cumulative impacts. The proposed Projects are six of several proposed renewable development projects that would impact existing and proposed land uses within the general Project area. Similar potential impacts can result from these projects as from the Projects with respect to consistency with the subject general plan land use plans and policies, impacts to compatibility with surrounding land uses, and regulatory compliance with zoning ordinances. All cumulative projects that may be approved and implemented would also assess potential impacts related to land use and planning. The proposed Projects were found to have less than significant impacts related to compliance with County zoning, consistency with the County General Plan Land Use Plan intent and applicable land use conformance criteria, dividing an existing community, and with no significant impacts to the adjacent City of Lancaster. Additionally, the proposed Projects would not result in any significant or unavoidable land use impacts and represent a small fraction of the total amount of lands affected by renewable projects and foreseeable projects within a 5 mile radius of the Projects. Therefore, the proposed Projects would not be expected to significantly contribute to potential cumulative land use related impacts associated with other projects in the region. **(DEIR at 4.10-44)**.

3.11 NOISE

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative Noise impacts.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1, which mitigate or avoid significant Noise impacts. Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant Noise impact.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Two non-Applicant projects identified have the potential to result in cumulative construction noise impacts, due to the projects being located in relatively close proximity to the proposed Projects, but not close enough to result in vibration impacts. The Western Antelope Dry Ranch project (CUP 11-07) is located approximately 1-mile north of Project 2, and the High Desert LLC (CUP 10-03) project is located approximately 1-mile north of Project 4. These distances are close enough that construction noise could propagate out to distances near the Applicant's Projects, but are not close enough to potentially result in vibration impacts. The time period of construction for these two projects is unknown, but if construction were to overlap with construction of the proposed Projects, there is the potential for increased temporary noise levels at residences; however, none of the noise sensitive receptors that are located in close proximity to Project 4 are also located in close proximity to Antelope Solar 1 or Antelope Solar Farm projects. Therefore, sound levels from construction of the Projects would only be minimally increased (less than 1-2 dBA), or not at all, by simultaneous construction. Therefore, overall cumulative impacts of the proposed Projects 1 – 6 would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures N-1 to N-9. **(DEIR at 4.11-56)**.

3.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Public Services.

Finding:

Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Public Services. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Projects amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. It is assumed that for each of the cumulative projects, worksite traffic control plans, permits, and coordination with County departments regarding potential construction impacts would be implemented. **(DEIR at 4.12-16)**.

Projects 1 – 6 would not cause effects to result in significant demands to fire response times. Projects 1 – 6 would be designed with appropriate fire protection considerations, and would also result in less than significant impacts to staffing and response times. Furthermore, Projects 1 – 6 would be required to provide taxes to the County that are designed to address cumulative fire department needs associated with new and existing developments. Other developments in the vicinity of Projects 1 – 6 would also be required to pay taxes and fees to the County to provide for their potential increase to LACFD fire protection service demands (LACFD 2009). Additionally, all development in the area is subject to review and approval by the Fire Department. This ensures that all projects contain appropriate controls to reduce demand on the fire department. As a result, Projects 1 – 6 would be anticipated to result in less than significant incremental contributions to cumulative fire protection impacts. **(DEIR at 4.12-17)**.

Projects 1 – 6 would not cause effects to result in significant demands to sheriff staffing or response times. Projects 1 – 6 would also implement site security control, including 24-hour remotely monitored video cameras for security monitoring to prevent potential theft and vandalism activities. Additionally, a portion of Projects 1 – 6 taxes levied would be allocated to sheriff services. Other developments in the vicinity of Projects 1 – 6 would also be required to pay taxes that would be allocated to sheriff services. As a result, construction and operation of Projects 1 – 6 would be anticipated to result in less than significant incremental contributions to cumulative sheriff protection impacts. Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with sheriff services would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-17)**.

Because development of Projects 1-6 will not induce population growth, no direct or cumulative impacts to schools, parks, libraries or other public facilities will occur. **(DEIR at 4.12-15; 4.12-16)**.

3.13 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Transportation and Traffic.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 1, which mitigate or avoid significant impacts to Transportation and Traffic. Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Transportation and Traffic.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Cumulative impacts for transportation and traffic are the combined effect of Projects 1 – 6 with the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects (other projects). This Cumulative Impacts discussion addresses the cumulative impacts of the Applicant's Projects 1 – 6 and the other projects within a geographic radius of 5-mile radius of the Projects (Project Study Area), which could potentially coincide with the expected construction schedule of the Applicant's Projects. Based on evaluation of the Project Study Area and available data from Los Angeles County, there are 29 other projects that have the potential to contribute additional traffic volume within the vicinity of Projects 1-6.

Evaluation of the cumulative impacts within the Project Study Area was focused on the construction-phase traffic for Projects 1-6 and other projects within a 5-mile radius. As previously stated in the individual conclusions for Project 1 above, the operational phase for each Project is anticipated to only generate a maximum of 4 vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hours on a quarterly or as-needed basis with a maximum of 12 additional trips, which would only occur when panel washing operations are being conducted. Based on the traffic analysis contained in the DEIR, the operational phase vehicle trips/traffic for the Projects are considered negligible and would not result in a significant cumulative impact on the traffic and/or transportation infrastructure in the Project Study Area. **(DEIR at 4.13-41 to 4.13-43)**.

3.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 1), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Utilities and Service Systems.

Finding:

Project 1, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Utilities and Service Systems. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis

assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, and regulations. Construction and operation of the cumulative projects would result in less than significant impacts to public facilities, which include electricity, gas, wastewater, and solid waste services. During construction, all cumulative projects would follow required measures to prevent construction interference to utility services, and would comply with recycling requirements to minimize solid waste disposal at solid waste facilities. During operation, the solar and wind generation projects would provide electricity, and would generate minimal amounts of solid waste. During operation, the non-solar/non-wind commercial and residential development projects would generate solid waste as would be expected from these residential and commercial uses; it is assumed that these project proponents have planned for and mitigated for the additional solid waste generation as appropriate.

The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would provide their own electricity for operational needs, no natural gas would be required for their operations, little wastewater (from panel washing) would be generated as part of the operations process, and very little solid waste would be generated. As a result, the total cumulative impacts to utility services would be less than significant, and the incremental contribution of Projects 1 – 6 to cumulative impacts related to utility services would be less than significant. Furthermore, because the Applicant has committed to using out of Basin water during construction and operations, Projects 1 – 6 would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to water supply impacts in the Basin, and would have no significant cumulative effect on water supply. **(DEIR at 4.14-28)**.

SECTION 4.0 FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

These Findings and Statements of Fact regarding project alternatives and certain mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR are set forth to comply with Section 21002 of the Public Resources Code and Sections 15091(a)(3) and 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines. Five alternatives to the proposed Project (consisting of Projects 1-6) described in the Draft EIR were analyzed and considered as follows: 1) No Project Alternative; 2) Lower Intensity Projects; 3) Select Other Project Sites Alternative; 4) Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative; and 5) Wind Energy Generation Alternative. These alternatives constitute a reasonable range of alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. For the reasons set forth below, Alternatives 1-5 are rejected as infeasible for the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations set forth below.

4.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Description:

Under the No Project Alternative, Project sites 1-6 would remain in their present condition with site conditions (i.e., fallow agricultural land) as they currently exist.

Finding:

The No Project Alternative is rejected as infeasible because it fails to meet the Project goals and objectives, and would not contribute to the State's ability to meet its near- and long-term renewable energy generation goals and objectives.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would not be approved or implemented under the No Project Alternative. The potential environmental impacts and benefits of the proposed Projects would not occur as a direct consequence of implementation under the No Project Alternative. The No Project Alternative would involve taking no action to generate 172 MW of clean, renewable electrical power utilizing solar PV technology and to integrate the electrical output of the Projects into the electrical grid. This alternative would not allow one of the primary purposes of the proposed Projects which is to increase the output of renewable energy in support of the RPS, such that the State of California may meet its current and planned goals for increasing renewable generation at reasonable market rates.

The No Project Alternative assumes that the sites will remain as they currently exist (primarily fallow agricultural land) and no environmental impacts would result. In summary, the No Project Alternative is provided for comparative purposes to the proposed Projects 1 – 6. This alternative is incapable of meeting the stated goals and objectives of the Projects to provide 172 MW of renewable electric energy to utility providers, and does not contribute to the state's ability to meet its near-term and long-term renewable energy generation goals and objectives. **(DEIR 5-1 to 5-2)**.

4.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: LOWER INTENSITY PROJECTS

Description:

Under the Lower Intensity Projects Alternative, fewer than six sites would be developed, and the smaller projects would be developed in a size and configuration that would result in generation of fewer than 172 MW of electricity.

Finding:

The Lower Intensity Projects Alternative is rejected as infeasible because it partially fails to accomplish the goals of the proposed Projects, which are to provide 172 MW of clean, renewable electric energy using solar PV technology, and to deliver the electric output on a wholesale basis to utility providers.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Projects 1-6 are designed to meet the increasing demand for clean, renewable electrical power. Any reduction in the size of the effort results in a similar potential reduction in the reliance on foreign sources of fuel, the diversification of energy portfolios, the contribution to the reduction

of GHG emissions, and the generation of "green" jobs. It would also potentially reduce the contribution to the much needed on-peak power to the electrical grid in California.

The opportunity to develop solar power in Los Angeles County has a limited timeframe because the utility companies, which purchase the power, would purchase power from another entity if the proposed Projects are not completed in a timely manner. If Los Angeles County does not approve the six viable SGFs proposed here, the opportunity to contribute to the competitive solar generation business in the County will be further lost to other projects. The proposed Projects are well-positioned to compete in the industry, are comparatively environmentally superior to most other locations, and have good positions for PPAs and interconnection agreements. Additionally, any reduction of the megawatts produced from these Projects would further limit the County's contribution to the State's renewable energy production goals. These 5 to 52 MW Projects meet the utility industry needs for small projects, and any reduction of the respective Projects' size would jeopardize the success of the Projects. **(DEIR at 5-2)**.

4.3 ALTERNATIVE 3: SELECT OTHER PROJECT SITES ALTERNATIVE

Description:

Under the Select Other Project Sites Alternative, other properties could potentially be used for the six Project sites.

Finding:

The Select Other Project Sites Alternative is rejected, because this alternative would have the same or greater impacts to the environment as Projects 1-6, which can all be mitigated to below a level of significance.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

One key objective for the Project Applicant was to locate the Projects in an area with the following characteristics: (1) adequate solar radiation; (2) close proximity to interconnection locations for each solar site; (3) project sites with landowners who are willing to sell large enough parcels of land for solar generation at market price; (4) lack of threatened and/or endangered biological species on the site; (5) lack of nearby sensitive receptors or land uses to minimize potential conflicts with development (6) relatively flat sites that have previously been disturbed to minimize disturbance to native habitat and to minimize the need for site grading; (7) existing access to accommodate construction workforce needs; and (8) access to nearby workforce to minimize traffic and socioeconomic impacts. The Applicant performed in-depth analyses of over 10,000 acres of land in the Western Antelope Valley, as shown in DEIR Figure 6-1. Of the 10,000 acres screened, only ten percent met the criteria listed above.

The six Project sites selected and proposed by the Applicant are the most viable sites to develop solar electricity generation with minimal environmental impacts. These sites were also chosen for development based on interconnection capacity and requirements placed on the Applicant by the utility providers. Selection of other alternative sites would have the same or greater impacts

to the environment since the present Projects are the result of a long and intense effort by the Applicant to find and acquire the most suitable sites according to the criteria given above. **(DEIR at 1-6; 5-3)**. Furthermore, the environmental impacts for Projects 1-6 can all be mitigated to below a level of significance.

4.4 ALTERNATIVE 4: ROOFTOP SOLAR GENERATION

Description:

Under the Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative, solar photovoltaic panels would be installed on private rooftops.

Finding:

The Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative is rejected as infeasible, because the Project Applicant does not have the ability to install solar panels on private rooftops.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

For rooftop solar to be a viable alternative to the proposed Projects it would need to provide 172 MW of electricity into the local grid. Assuming one residential installation can produce 25 kilowatts of electricity, a total of 6,880 residential installations would be needed to produce 172 MW of electricity. The Applicant does not have the ability to install solar panels on private rooftops; therefore this alternative is not feasible for the Applicant. **(DEIR at 5-3)**.

4.5 ALTERNATIVE 5: WIND ENERGY GENERATION

Description:

Under the Wind Energy Generation Alternative, electricity would be generated through the use of wind turbines.

Finding:

The Wind Energy Generation Alternative is rejected as infeasible, because the type of geographical location that is suitable for a wind farm is not available within the vicinity.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

For wind energy generation to be a reasonable alternative to the proposed Projects and meet the purpose and need of the proposed Projects, it would need to provide 172 MW of electricity into the local grid; and to be sited on previously disturbed land that utilizes existing electrical distribution facilities, ROWs, roads, and other existing infrastructure where feasible to minimize the need for new electrical support facilities. The area required for construction and operation of a 172 MW wind farm would require a much more specific type of geographical location than the

Projects to provide adequate wind; a feasible project area of the nature required for wind electricity production is not readily available within the area of analysis for the proposed Projects. For this reason, this alternative is infeasible. **(DEIR at 5-3)**.

SECTION 5.0 FINDINDS REGARDING THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM ("MMRP")

Pursuant to Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code, the Commission, in adopting these Findings, also adopts the MMRP for the Silverado Power West Los Angeles Project. This Program is designed to ensure that, during Project implementation, the County and other responsible parties will comply with the mitigation measures adopted in these Findings.

The Commission hereby finds that the MMRP, which is incorporated herein by reference and attached as Exhibit A to these Findings, meets the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 by providing for the implementation and monitoring of Project conditions intended to mitigate potential environmental effects of the Project.

SECTION 6.0 CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15091 AND 15092 FINDINGS

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the administrative record, the Commission has made one or more of the following findings with respect to each of the significant effects of the Project:

A. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects on the environment.

B. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and such changes have been adopted by such other agency, or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the administrative record, and as conditioned by the foregoing:

A. All significant effects on the environment due to the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible.

SECTION 7.0 CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15084(D)(3) AND 15084(D)(4) FINDINGS

The County has relied on Sections 15084(d)(3) of the State CEQA guidelines, which allow acceptance of working drafts prepared by the Applicant, a consultant retained by the Applicant, or any other person. The County has also relied upon Section 15084(d)(4), which allows the Draft EIR to be prepared directly by, or under contract by the lead agency. The County has reviewed and edited as necessary the submitted drafts to reflect the County's own independent judgment, including reliance on County technical personnel from other departments.

SECTION 8.0 PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21082.1(C) FINDINGS

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(c), the Commission hereby finds that the lead agency has independently reviewed and analyzed the Final EIR, and that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency.

SECTION 9.0 NATURE OF FINDINGS

Any finding made by this Commission shall be deemed made, regardless of where it appears in this document. All of the language included in this document constitutes findings by this Commission, whether or not any particular sentence or clause includes a statement to that effect. This Commission intends that these Findings be considered as an integrated whole and, whether or not any part of these Findings fail to cross reference or incorporate by reference any other part of these findings, that any finding required or committed to be made by this Commission with respect to any particular subject matter of the Final EIR, shall be deemed to be made if it appears in any portion of these Findings.

SECTION 10.0 RELIANCE ON RECORD

Each and all of the findings and determinations contained herein are based on the competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire administrative record relating to the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project. The findings and determinations constitute the independent findings and determinations of this Commission in all respects, and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.

SECTION 11.0 RELATIONSHIP OF FINDINGS TO EIR

The County finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the EIR or is in the record of proceedings in the matter.

SECTION 12.0 CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS

The custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the County's decision is based is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning located at 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012.

EXHIBIT A
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
(“MMRP”)

CEQA requires a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for projects where mitigation measures are a condition of project approval and development. The Draft EIR prepared for the Silverado Power West, Los Angeles County Projects identified mitigation measures, where appropriate, to avoid or substantially reduce the environmental impacts associated with the Project. This MMRP is designed to monitor the implementation of those mitigation measures. Accordingly, this MMRP has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15097.

This section lists each of the proposed Project Design Features (PDFs) and required Mitigation Measures (MMs) and identifies the corresponding action required for proof of compliance, the mitigation timing, the party responsible for implementation, and the monitoring agency or party responsible for ensuring each measure is adequately implemented.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Silverado Power West, Los Angeles County Projects
Project Nos. R2011-00833, 00798, 00799, 00807, 00801, 00805
March 2014

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.1 AESTHETICS				
A-1 A Fugitive Dust Control Plan to minimize dust (visual pollution) shall be prepared and implemented.	A. Submit Plan to AVAQMD for review and approval	Prior to any ground disturbance activities	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP AVAQMD
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD
A-2 The Project site shall be maintained free of debris, trash, and waste during construction.	Site inspection	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP
A-3 The Project site shall be visually screened or partially screened during construction by fencing.	A. Submit Site Plans for review and approval	Prior to issuance of applicable building permit	Applicant	LACDRP
	B. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP
A-4 A landscape plan shall be developed for each Project prior to Project construction that shows the detail of a 10-foot wide screening vegetation buffer intended to screen or partially screen the Project visually from area residents or travelers on nearby roadways.	A. Submit landscape plan for review and approval. The landscape plan must be approved prior to grading or building permit.	Prior to 1st grading or building permit whichever comes first for each project.	Applicant	LACDRP/LACFD – support/referral Approval of landscape plan
	B. Implement approved landscape plan	Prior to first energization approval by LADPW B & S	Applicant	LACDRP/LACFD – support/referral Approval of landscape plan
A-5 All lighting shall comply with applicable provisions of the Los Angeles County Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Lights shall be limited to types allowed by the ordinance, installed below maximum allowed heights, pointed downwards and shielded to minimize light trespass, and mounted on	Submit final lighting plan for review and approval	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
essential infrastructure rather than on separate light poles except where poles are required by regulation or by governing agency. Lighting will comply with the hours of operation requirements in the ordinance, and utilize automatic control devices to comply with time limits except where permitted by Los Angeles County. Lighting will be maintained in good repair at all times.				
5.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY				
No mitigation measures are required for Agriculture and Forestry.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.3 AIR QUALITY				
AQ-1 Water active sites at least twice daily (locations where soil disturbance is to occur would be thoroughly watered before earthmoving) during construction.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVQMD
AQ-2 All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of CVC Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-3 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-4 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not be idle more than five minutes in any one hour.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-5 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operation of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-6 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-7 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.	Submit Transportation Demand Management program for review and approval	Prior to issuance of building permits	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPW support and referral for trip reduction determination

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
AQ-8 During array area preparation, mowing shall be used instead of grading and/or disking, and shall be limited to no more than 3.5 acres per day per site to further reduce dust emissions during construction.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-9 All interior roads shall use long-lasting non-toxic chemical soil stabilizers designed for long-term dust stabilization on dirt roads.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-10 Interior array areas shall have re-established pre-existing vegetation or be established with drought tolerant, native, or native compatible vegetation, to the greatest extent feasible, approved by the County biologist and compliant with Fire Department requirements, within two years of energization authorization of an array area by the Department of Public Works, Building and Safety Division, to provide long-term dust stabilization under the arrays.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Biologist	LACFD LACDRP
AQ-11 Earth disturbing activities shall be suspended and/or additional water shall be applied to meet Rule 403 criteria if wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP AVAQMD
AQ-12 Construction activity shall utilize electricity from power poles on or adjacent to the Project sites rather than use of temporary diesel power generators and/or gasoline power generators when electricity with adequate circuit capacity is available from power poles in proximity to construction areas.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-13 In the event temporary night lighting is necessary for construction or maintenance purposes, lighting not requiring the use of diesel or gasoline driven generators shall be used.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
B-1 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a qualified biologist shall be retained by the Applicant as the lead biological monitor subject to the approval of the LACDRP and CDFW. That person shall ensure that impacts to all biological resources are minimized or avoided, and shall conduct (or supervise) pre-grading field surveys for species that may be avoided, affected, or eliminated as a result of grading or any other site preparation activities. The lead biological monitor shall ensure that all surveys are conducted by qualified personnel (e.g. avian biologists for bird surveys, herpetologists for reptile surveys, etc.) and that they possess	A. Retain qualified Biologist(s)	Prior to issuance of Grading Permit	Applicant/Construction Monitor	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Field Surveys	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Maintain daily monitoring reports	During Construction	Applicant/Construction Monitor	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
all necessary permits and memoranda of understanding with the appropriate agencies for the handling of potentially-occurring special-status species. The lead biological monitor shall also ensure that daily monitoring reports (e.g., survey results, protective actions, results of protective actions, adaptive measures, etc.) are prepared, and shall make these monitoring reports available to DRP and CDFW at their request.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-2 Pre-Construction surveys will be conducted prior to ground disturbance at each project site. These surveys will include all special-status species identified as having the potential to be present on the project site; including, but not limited to, badger, kit fox, southern grasshopper mouse, and the species listed below. • Pre-survey information gathering will include reviewing of all available agency nest data and mapping. • A focused pre-construction Swainson's hawk survey shall be conducted to locate any nesting sites within 5 miles of Projects 1 – 6. If Swainson's hawks or their active nests are located within 500 feet of the project sites, all construction-related work shall be postponed and CDFW will be consulted. • Project-related activities likely to have the potential of disturbing suitable bird nesting habitat, which includes ground nesting birds, shall be prohibited from February 1 through August 31, unless a qualified monitoring biologist conducts nesting bird surveys prior to any construction-related disturbance to confirm the absence of active bird nests or bird nesting habitat. Disturbance shall be defined as any activity that physically removes or damages vegetation or habitat or any action that may cause disruption of nesting behavior such as loud noise from equipment or artificial night lighting. Surveys shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. If an active bird nest is discovered, disturbance within 500 feet for raptors shall be postponed until the nest is vacated, offspring are independent of the nest area and there is no evidence of further attempts at nesting. Limits of avoidance shall be marked with high-visibility flagging or fencing. The Applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures and submit the records to LACDRP and CDFW to document compliance with applicable state and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds. • A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted on each site prior to grading. Pre-construction surveys for burrowing owl shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to	Pre-construction surveys for special-status species that have been identified as having potential to occur on site	Prior to grading or as specified per species	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
the commencement of disturbance. The surveys shall follow the protocols set forth by the California Burrowing Owl Consortium (1993 and 2012). If burrowing owls are found during the pre-construction survey, then replacement burrows and habitat must be provided prior to the commencement of construction. The Applicant shall be prepared to provide artificial replacement burrows in the event that owls are detected, either as wintering or breeding individuals. Wintering individuals may be evicted with the use of exclusion devices followed by a period of seven days to ensure that animals have left their burrows. When it can be assured that owls are no longer using the burrows, the burrows can be hand excavated and collapsed under the supervision of the avian biologist. Breeding owls must not be disturbed and must be allowed to complete the raising of young until the fledglings can forage independently of adults and it can be confirmed that further attempts at nesting shall not be undertaken. When this has been confirmed, the owls can be evicted as described above for wintering animals. • Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for special-status ground-dwelling reptiles, including but not limited to coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard. Surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground 4 to 6 weeks in advance of the survey effort, checking weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles or other species determined important by the qualified biological monitor (i.e., biologist must be appropriately permitted for collection and relocation activities) occurring within the work area prior to the start of work shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.				
B-3 During grading, earthmoving activities, and other construction activities the biological monitor shall be present to inspect and enforce all mitigation requirements and to relocate any species that may come into harm's way to an appropriate offsite location of similar habitat. The biological monitor shall be authorized to stop specific grading or	Biological Monitoring	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
construction activities if violations of mitigation measures or any local, state, or federal laws are suspected. The biological monitor shall file a report of the monitoring activities with LACDRP and CDFW. If ongoing biological monitoring of construction activities reveals the presence of any special-status reptiles within an active work area, then work shall be temporarily halted until the animals can be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones. Work areas shall be surveyed for special-status reptile species, such as the coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard, during construction activities. During the construction, surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground in appropriate work areas and checking them weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles occurring within the work area shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-4 Mitigation lands shall be acquired for Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, special-status migratory and wintering birds, and alkali mariposa lily. <u>Swainson's hawk</u>: Impacts due to development of the projects shall be mitigated by the acquisition of good quality Swainson's hawk habitat targeted within the Antelope Valley. Land shall be purchased or placed in a conservation easement or other suitable deed restriction and managed to maintain suitable habitat in perpetuity. The proposed development is not expected to result in the "take" of Swainson's hawk; however, the Applicant shall be required to consult CDFW in the event of take, which may result in additional mitigation prescribed by CDFW. Although the Projects are not expected to result in "take" of Swainson's hawk, mitigation will still be required to alleviate the effects of cumulative impacts on raptor, migratory bird, and burrowing owl habitats: Replacement land will be provided based on the quality of the mitigation land relative to the impacted habitat. The ratio of such replacement shall be determined as follows: • A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 3 acres of development if the replacement land is superior nesting and foraging habitat contiguous to occupied nesting and foraging habitat, and is within a designated or proposed Significant Ecological Area (SEA). • A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 2 acres of development if the replacement land is unoccupied irrigated land, contiguous to occupied habitat and providing superior quality foraging habitat with trees or other such nesting habitat; • A ratio of 1 acre of replacement land for each acre of development if the replacement land provides similar foraging and nesting habitat. <u>Burrowing Owl</u>: Mitigation for any occupied burrowing owl burrows found during pre-construction surveys will include a comprehensive tiered approach: • Pre-construction and construction monitoring surveys conducted by a qualified biologist to detect potential new owl activity onsite;	A. Acquire mitigation lands for Swainson's Hawk	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Acquire mitigation lands for Burrowing Owl	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Pre-construction survey for Alkali Mariposa Lilies	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	D. If necessary Acquire Alkali Mariposa Mitigation land	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
• Disturbance avoidance of occupied burrows during nesting period February 1 – August 31; • Impact avoidance of occupied burrows; • Burrow exclusion and closure and offsite relocation (>100 m), as described previously in in B-2, will be conducted for unavoidable impacts to occupied burrows (after consultation with CDFW). • Minimizing impacts by protecting in-place any owls, their burrows, and their immediate habitat by establishing setback zones and visual screens for burrows adjacent to construction activity; by placing visible markers, and by conducting construction worker awareness training. Setback widths will be applied as appropriate to the level of existing disturbance and owl stage of activity (e.g., for low to moderate construction-related disturbance activity outside the nesting season near burrows in currently high-traffic or disturbance areas, it is assumed owls are adapted to human disturbance and will not need a large setback). • Mitigating unavoidable impacts to habitat: restore temporary impacts to pre-existing conditions; replace nesting/occupied and satellite burrows lost with the same number of suitable burrows on the mitigation site. Mitigation acreage for foraging habitat provided for Swainson's hawk will be sufficient to replace lost burrowing owl habitat because the hawk's replacement habitat will be in-kind or better (i.e., the Project habitat is low quality overall and mitigation habitat will be at least the same quality as the lost habitat OR will have higher quality habitat features overall, such as increased vegetative structure, higher numbers of prey species, less disturbance, and less potential for predation by domestic animals, etc.). Specific habitat considerations as provided in the CDFW 2012 burrowing owl guidance will be considered in selecting the overall habitat replacement acres for the project. <u>Alkali Mariposa Lily</u>: Alkali mariposa lily will be avoided to the greatest extent possible. If pre-construction surveys reveal individuals that cannot be avoided, mitigation of lost alkali mariposa lily shall be provided at a minimum 1:1 ratio. This acreage will be calculated with input from LACDRP and CDFW. Additionally, because alkali mariposa Lilies have locally available seed sources, plantings of the lilies on				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
appropriate soil types on Projects shall be implemented in selected areas. The lilies may also be transplanted from areas planned for disturbance to more suitable locations in the Project area. Transplantation locations must be situated within adequately buffered areas to be found suitable. For all species the mitigation acreage may be located within the Project sites, but outside of the area of development, subject to LACDRP and CDFW approval, if acreage of sufficient quantity and quality exists.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-5 Review and Approval of Habitat Management Lands Prior to Acquisition: The Applicant shall provide a mitigation land acquisition proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for their approval before acquiring the property. The proposal shall discuss the suitability of the property by comparing it to the selection criteria. As a part of the preparation of the land acquisition proposal, acreage quantification by habitat category will be developed with LACDRP and CDFW based on the following criteria: <u>Habitat Management Land Selection Criteria</u>: The Applicant must identify the region within which lands shall be acquired, and the type and quality of habitat to be acquired. Detailed criteria and acreage for each habitat category will be developed with Los Angeles County and CDFW. Foraging habitat shall be assessed as moderate to good with a capacity to improve in quality and value to Swainson's hawks, and must be within the Antelope Valley Swainson's hawk breeding range. Foraging habitat with suitable nest trees is preferred. <u>Habitat Management Lands Acquisition</u>: Prior to initiating ground-disturbing activities, the Applicant shall provide a proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for off-site mitigation land to be restored, enhanced, or maintained according to the requirements of the biological mitigation measures in this EIR. The proposal will require that mitigation lands identified shall be preserved as open space in perpetuity. Within 45 days of acquiring the mitigation land(s), the Applicant shall record a permanent deed restriction on the mitigation land(s) to be preserved as open space. The deed restriction or conservation easement language shall be submitted to LACDRP and CDFW for review and approval prior to recordation. Alternatively, should a conservation easement on the mitigation land be offered, the permanent conservation easement shall be recorded to the satisfaction of LACDRP and CDFW. The Applicant shall establish a fund sufficient for the restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation land(s) until such time when the mitigation land(s) become self-sustaining and until such time as the mitigation land(s) meet the requirements of this mitigation measure. The fund shall be established within 90 days of mitigation land(s)	A. Obtain approval of habitat management lands	Prior to Acquisition	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Record a permanent deed restriction or conservation easement on mitigation land(s)	Within 45 days of acquiring land(s)	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Establish fund in the amount acceptable to LACDRP and CDFW for restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation lands	Within 90-days of mitigation land(s) acquisition	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
acquisition in an amount acceptable to the LACDRP and CDFW.				
Land Acquisition Schedule and Financial Assurances: The Applicant shall complete acquisition, or execute an irrevocable option to purchase, of proposed Habitat Management lands and shall provide financial assurances for dedicating adequate funding for impact avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, if necessary, prior to the issuance of building permits. If an irrevocable option to purchase is utilized, the applicant shall provide a proposed date of purchase which coincides with construction of the facility.				
B-6 Prior to alteration of any streambeds, the Applicant shall enter into an agreement with the CDFW, pursuant to Sections 1601 through 1603 of the State Fish and Game Code.	Enter into an agreement with CDFW pursuant to sections 1601 through 1603	Prior to alteration of Streambed	Applicant	CDFW
B-7 Within all interior portions of the site within and adjacent to the proposed solar arrays, re-vegetation shall be accomplished (excluding interior roads as follows: Vegetation seeded in these areas shall comprise locally-sourced, native species if available, or, native compatible as approved by the County biologist if sufficient locally-sourced native seed stock not available, approximating low-growing communities such as native perennial or annual grasslands (i.e., wildflower fields). Shrub species shall not be used due to these species inability to survive continued vegetation trimming. Vegetation shall be maintained in accordance with Los Angeles County Fire Department regulations.	Revegetation of interior site, excluding interior roads	After construction	Applicant	LACDRP
5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES				
CUL-1 In the event cultural resources are encountered during construction of the Projects, all ground-disturbing activities within the vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall be notified of the find. The archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American Monirot shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to recordation and excavation of the finds and evaluation and processing of the finds in accordance with § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Potentially significant cultural resources	A. Archaeological monitoring and Native American monitor when there is a find	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP NAHC
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Site inspection as needed	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
consist of, but are not limited to, stone, bone, fossils, wood or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resources are determined to be unique historic resources as defined under § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, Mitigation Measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate Mitigation Measures for significant resources could include but not be limited to avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. No further earthwork shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any archaeological artifacts recovered because of mitigation will be donated to a qualified scientific institution approved by the Lead Agency where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.			Archaeologist	
CUL-2 In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, California State Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 dictates that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to CEQA regulations and PRC § 5097.98. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.	A. Archaeological and Native American monitoring	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist/NAHC representative	LACDRP NAHC
	B. Maintain documentation demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-3 Project 4 construction of gen-tie lines shall maintain the right of way buffer zones prescribed by SCE for this historic electric transmission line resource, which is an active transmission line. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-4 Project construction for Project 4 shall maintain a one acre undisturbed area surrounding the Del Sur Cemetery	A. Submit pre-construction surveys	Prior to construction	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
site. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	B. Construction monitoring by qualified Archaeologist	During construction	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Submit construction monitoring documentation	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	D. Site inspection as needed	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-5 A County approved archaeologist will be retained to initiate and supervise cultural resource monitoring during Project related earthwork in areas of the Project that are within 50 feet from certain significant cultural resources, specifically from the defined perimeter of site CA-LAN-1579H (Project 4). If resources are identified, the procedures outlined in CUL-1 will be followed and/or CUL-2 (as necessary). This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	A. Archaeological monitoring	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
PALEO-1: A qualified paleontologist shall be retained by the Applicant prior to excavations reaching 10 feet in depth or greater. A The paleontologist shall develop and execute a Paleontological Resource Mitigation and Monitoring Program and supervise a paleontological monitor whom shall monitor all ground-disturbing activities associated with such excavations. The Program will outline the procedures to follow in regards to paleontological resources (e.g. monitoring protocols, curation, data recovery of fossils, reporting). If fossils are found during such excavation, the paleontological monitor shall be authorized to halt ground-disturbing activities within 25 feet of the find in order to allow evaluation of the find and determination of appropriate treatment according to the Program.	Paleontological Monitoring	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Paleontologist	LACDRP LAC Natural History Museum support/referral
5.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
No mitigation measures are required for Geology and Soils.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS				
GHG-1 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment	A. Submit operating permit(s) as required	Prior to commencement of construction	Applicant	AVAQMD LACDRP
	B. Maintain log	During construction	Applicant/Construction	AVAQMD

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.	demonstrating compliance		Manager	LACDRP
GHG-2 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not be idle more than five minutes in any one hour.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-3 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have proper training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operations of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-4 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 mph or less.	Site inspection as needed	During construction and grading	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-5 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	Prior to Building Permit	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.8 HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS WASTES				
HH-1 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Materials Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.	Submit Hazardous Materials Management Plan	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC
HH-2 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.	Submit Hazardous Waste Management Plan for each Project	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC
HH-3 Prior to the start of construction activities on the parcel containing the historic UST at the location of Project 1, a Phase I ESA will be completed. This mitigation measure only applies to Project 1.	Phase I ESA	Prior to issuance of grading permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP
HH-4 Prior to the start of construction activities, a closure permit for the UST will be verified or obtained from the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Health Hazardous Materials Division. This mitigation measure only applies to Project 1.	Closure permit or verification for UST – Project 1 site	Prior to issuance of grading permit(s)	Applicant	LACFD
HH-5 Construction activities shall be halted if previously unidentified soil contamination is observed or indicated by testing during any earthwork activities. Construction will be halted or redirected until such soil contamination is evaluated and disposed of and/or treated	Testing of soil contamination	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC LACDRP
5.9 HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY				
Construction				
HYDRO-1 Education and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants and Employees. Appropriate educational materials and training for preventing stormwater pollution and additional BMP Fact Sheets from the California Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks can be found at www.cabmphandbooks.com. Practical information material will be provided to employees on general good housekeeping practices. These materials will describe, but are not limited to, spill prevention and control and the use of chemicals, petroleum products, pesticides and fertilizers that should be limited to the property, with no discharge of wastes directly or indirectly to gutters, catch basins or the storm drain system. Information will be distributed directly to the employees as well as being posted in public areas. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities. The required materials shall be	Maintain log demonstrating compliance of Educational materials and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants, and Employee	During Construction	Applicant	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
available at each project site and a log kept to show education has occurred prior to the start of construction.				
HYDRO-2 A spill contingency plan will be prepared by the owner/building operator. As a minimum the Spill Contingency Plan will "mandate the stockpiling of cleanup materials, notification of responsible agencies, disposal of cleanup materials and documentation." This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Submit spill contingency plan	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACDRP
HYDRO-3 No hazardous materials are anticipated to be stored on-site. If deemed otherwise, a designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in accordance with requirements of the Health & Safety Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction and operations	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACFD
HYDRO-4 A designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in compliance of the current requirements of the County of Los Angeles Fire Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Submit all applicable information	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACFD
Operation				
HYDRO-5 Site waste receptacles shall be emptied on a weekly basis or more often if containers approach overflowing. Upon inspection any debris or rubbish will be picked up and the site cleaned. The trash area/room is NOT to be cleaned by hosing down. The type of materials used to clean the area and storage of said materials will be determined by the Contractor. Signage will be posted that lids shall be kept closed at all times. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 at all times during facility operations.	A. Include waste collection and disposal methods in construction contract specifications	During operation	Applicant	LACSD LACDRP
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During operation	Applicant	LACSD LACDRP
5.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING				
No mitigation measures are required for Land Use and Planning	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.11 NOISE				
N-1 Construction operations would not occur between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday, or at any time on Sunday with the exception of limited low-noise	Maintain log of construction equipment arrivals and exit times demonstrating	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
generating potential night work with Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning and Public Works approval.	compliance			
N-2 Construction site and access road maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour shall be established and enforced during the construction period.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-3 Electrically-powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, except for devices like trucks, loaders, dozers, and other heavy equipment.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-4 Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far as practicable, and no closer than 1,000 feet, from noise-sensitive receptors.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
	B. Inclusion of requirement for a Noise Control Plan	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
N-5 The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells are prohibited except where required by OSHA or for safety or emergency warning purposes required by other regulatory agencies.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-6 Project-related public address or music systems used on-site shall not be audible at any adjacent receptor.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
N-7 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 which are in compliance with any applicable legally required equipment noise standards. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors) shall be equipped with shrouds and/or other noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment. Mobile sound barriers with a sound transmission class of 19 or greater will be used for pile driving on Projects where received sound levels at the nearest NSR are predicted to be above the County construction noise limit of 60 dBA during the day.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
	B. Site inspection as needed	During Construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including: **N-8** Siting substations to achieve NEMA sound ratings at sensitive receptors as described in Section 4.11.5.2 not to be closer to the property line of sensitive receptors than the following distances for each individual project: • Project 1 – 325 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 74 dBA • Project 2 – 1,511 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 81 dBA • Project 3 – 650 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 74 dBA • Project 4 (two transformers) – 1,000 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 77 dBA • Project 5 – 748 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 82 dBA	A. Submit acoustical report demonstrating substation design compliance with applicable noise standards	Prior to issuance of relevant building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer
	B. Construct structures in compliance with noise limit requirements of applicable County codes.	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH
	C. Submit post-construction noise measurements verifying compliance upon request	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support/referral
With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including: **N-9** The Applicant shall choose to use NEMA low noise rated transformer equipment which will achieve 10 dBA or greater noise reduction as compared to standard NEMA-rated transformers of a similar size and rated capacity to ensure that Project noise impacts would be less than significant.	A. Submit acoustical report demonstrating substation design compliance with applicable noise standards	Prior to issuance of relevant building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer
	B. Construct structures in compliance with noise limit requirements of applicable County codes.	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH
	C. Submit post-construction noise measurements verifying compliance upon request	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support/referral
5.12 PUBLIC SERVICES				
No mitigation measures are required for Public Services	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.13 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC				
TT-1 Prior to issuance of first grading or building permit, Applicant shall document and submit all required information	Submit Projects' road survey	Prior to issuance of first grading or building	Applicant	LACDPW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
and/or material pertaining to the pavement conditions of construction routes for the Projects, including the formula for calculation of the Projects' fair share of any repair or reconstruction of construction routes to the satisfaction of LACDPW. Applicant shall reimburse the County of Los Angeles for the cost of any repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes attributable to the Projects as agreed to by LACDPW. The timing of any necessary repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes and the required payment by the Applicant shall be determined by LACDPW.		permit		
TT-2 The County, including LACFD Fire Stations 78 (for R2011-00801) and 130 (for R2011-00798, 00799, 00805,00807, & 00833) shall be notified at least three days in advance of any street closures that may affect fire and/or paramedic responses in the area. The Applicant shall provide alternate route (detour) plans to the County, including three sets to LACFD, with a tentative schedule of planned closures, prior to the beginning of construction.	Provide street closure notifications	Three days prior to any street closures impacting fire and/or paramedics	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACFD
TT-3 Stagger construction work shifts before or after peak traffic hours.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support referral Caltrans
	B. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support referral Caltrans
TT-4 Schedule truck deliveries during off peak hours.	Maintain log of truck arrivals and exit times demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
TT-5 Limit water truck deliveries during the AM peak hour to 30 percent of the daily water truck trips.	Maintain log of truck arrivals and exit times demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
TT-6 Encourage carpooling between construction works.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
5.14 UTILITIES				
No mitigation measures are required for Utilities.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
List of Acronyms: B & S – building and safety BMP – Best Management Practice CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act CASQA – California Association of Stormwater Quality Agencies CBC – California Building Code CDFW – California Department of Fish and Wildlife CUP – Conditional Use Permit CVC – California Vehicle Code dBA – decibels (acoustics) DPR – Department of Parks and Recreation ESA – Environmental Site Assessment hp – Horsepower LACDPW – Los Angeles County Department of Public Works LACFD – Los Angeles County Fire Department mph – miles per hour NEMA – National Electrical Manufacturers Association OSHA – Occupational Safety and Health Administration PRC – Public Resources Code ROW – Right of Way SCE – Southern California Edison SWPPP – Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan UFC – Uniform Fire Code UST – Underground Storage Tank WATCH – Work Area Traffic Control Handbook LACDPH – Los Angeles County Department of Public Health LACSD – Los Angeles County Sanitation District				

FINDINGS OF FACT REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

FOR THE SILVERADO POWER WEST LOS ANGELES COUNTY PROJECT

PROJECT SITE NO. 2 (Western Antelope Blue Sky Ranch)

COUNTY PROJECT NO. R2011-00798-(5)

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 201100070

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 201100109

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2012061068

PROJECT FINDINGS ORGANIZATION

Section 1	Introduction
Section 2	Findings Regarding Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Have Been Mitigated to a Less than Significant Level
Section 3	Findings Regarding Cumulative Environmental Effects Which are Not Significant or Which Have Been Mitigated to a Less Than Significant Level
Section 4	Findings Regarding Project Alternatives
Section 5	Findings Regarding the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Section 6	CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 and 15092 Findings
Section 7	CEQA Guidelines Section 15084(D)(3) and 15084(D)(4) Findings
Section 8	Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(C) Findings
Section 9	Nature of Findings
Section 10	Reliance on Record
Section 11	Relationship of Findings to EIR
Section 12	Custodian of Records
Exhibit A	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP")

SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The County of Los Angeles ("County") Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") hereby certifies and finds that the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County ("Project") Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR"), State Clearinghouse Number 2012061068, has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq., "CEQA") and the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Cal. Code Regs. Sections 15000 et seq., "CEQA Guidelines").

The Project Final EIR consists of the following documents: (1) December 2013 Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR" or "DEIR"); (2) December 2013 Technical Appendices to the Draft EIR; and (3) March 2014 Final EIR.

The Commission hereby further certifies that it received, reviewed and considered the information contained in the following: (i) the Final EIR; (ii) the application for Conditional Use Permit No. 201100070; and (iii) all hearings, and submissions of testimony from County officials and departments, the Applicant (as defined herein), the public, other public agencies, community groups, and organizations.

Concurrently with the adoption of these findings, the Commission adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP"), attached hereto as Exhibit A. Having received, reviewed and considered the foregoing information, as well as any and all information in the administrative record and the record of proceedings, the Commission hereby makes the following Findings of Fact ("Findings") pursuant to and in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15090:

SECTION 1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

1.1.1 Project Location.

The Project site is located in the northern portion of unincorporated Los Angeles County. The EIR analyzed a total of six (6) individual Project sites (collectively, "Projects" or "Projects 1-6"), which will each be subject to separate review and approval by the County.[1]

These Findings specifically pertain to "Project 2", which is approximately 157 acres and located approximately 11 miles west of downtown Lancaster, located at 110th Street West and West Avenue K. The Assessor's Parcel Number ("APN") for Project 2 is 3267-015-001. When complete, Project 2 would produce 40 megawatts ("MW") of electricity from solar photovoltaic modules.

[1] The six individual Projects are not dependent upon each other for success. Each Project can succeed as a stand-alone project if other projects are not approved by Los Angeles County or if technical or financial problems delay or block the completion of a Project. CEQA allows for a group of projects to be analyzed as a single EIR; each Project must also receive approval of its CUP application and other entitlements on the merits of the individual Project and individual site.

1.1.2 Project Description—Features Common to Projects 1 - 6.

There are certain general Project characteristics and features that will apply to each of the individual six Project sites, including Project 2, as follows:

All six of the Projects would be designed and built using the same or similar methods and would have similar Project characteristics. The Projects would utilize photovoltaic ("PV") technology on fixed-tilt or tracker mounting supports. The proposed PV Projects would be constructed in phases and operated for an estimated 35 years. Construction would generally take place during normal daylight hours and would conform to County construction requirements.

Each Project would consist of the following elements:

- PV modules;
- PV module mounting system;
- Balance of system and electrical boxes (e.g., combiner boxes, electrical disconnects);
- Substation (Projects 1 – 5);
- Electrical inverters and transformers;
- Electrical AC collection system, including switchgear;
- Data monitoring equipment;
- Generation tie line; and
- Access roads and chain link perimeter security fencing.

<u>Solar PV Generating Facilities</u>

The Solar Generating Facilities ("SGFs") are designed for optimum performance and ease of maintenance. The Projects would consist of a series of PV module arrays mounted on racking systems, which are typically supported by a pile-driven foundation design. The foundation design would be determined based on the full geotechnical survey. The module mounting system, or racking system, would have a fixed-tilt or tracker PV array configuration and would be oriented south to maximize the amount of incident solar radiation absorbed over the course of the year. Electricity from a series of PV arrays would be funneled and combined at combiner boxes located throughout the SGF. The electrical current would then be further collected and combined prior to feeding the inverters. The SGF would be laid out in a PV block design to allow adequate area for maintenance in the way of clearances or access roads.

Inverters would be consolidated in areas to minimize cable routing and trenching and ensure minimal electrical losses. The alternating current ("AC") from the inverters would be routed through an AC collection system and consolidated within system switchgear. The final output from the SGF would be processed through a transformer to match the interconnection voltage. Electrical safety and protection systems would be provided to meet utility, International Organization for Standardization, and regulatory codes and standards. The energy would be

delivered to the regional electrical distribution network. A security perimeter fence with appropriate signage for public protection would be installed. Points of ingress/egress would be accessed by locked gates for facility services and maintenance.

Photovoltaic Modules

The SGFs would require installation of PV modules. The total number of PV modules required would depend on the technology selected, optimization evaluation, and detailed design. The market conditions, economic considerations, and the environmental factors would be taken into account during the detail design process. The following PV module technologies or equivalent are being considered for incorporation into the Projects:

- PV thin-film technology
- PV crystalline silicon technology
- Fixed-tilt configuration; and
- Tracking design configuration.

The modules configured with a fixed tilt would be oriented toward the south and angled at a degree that would optimize solar resource efficiency. For the tracking configuration, the modules would rotate from east to west over the course of the day. Modules would be non-reflective and highly absorptive.

Standard Installation, Array Assembly, and Racking

The final racking system would be determined by optimization evaluations and economic assessments and incorporated into the detailed design. Likewise, the final foundation design would be determined based on the geotechnical survey for each of the PV Project locations. Once the foundation has been installed, the module mounting system would be installed on it. For a tracking configuration, motors would be installed to drive the tracking mechanism. The PV modules would be delivered to each site during construction to support the installation schedule. The module mounting system would be oriented in rows within a PV design block, presenting a standard and uniform appearance across the facility. The panel configuration would be uniform in height and width.

Collection, Inverters, AC Collection, and Transformers

Modules would be electrically connected into strings. Each string would be funneled by electrical conduit (typically underground) wiring to combiner boxes located throughout the solar field power blocks. The output power cables from the combiner boxes would be again consolidated and feed the direct current ("DC") electricity to inverters, which convert the DC to AC. Underground electrical cables would be installed using ordinary trenching techniques, which include excavation of trenches to accommodate conduits. Wire depth and trench backfill would be in accordance with local, state, and federal codes.

The AC energy would be stepped up to the appropriate interconnection voltage by system transformers to match the voltage at the grid interconnection. As required, switchgear cabinetry

would be provided where necessary for circuit control. All electrical inverters, transformers, and gear would be placed on concrete foundation structures.

Commissioning of equipment would include testing, calibration of equipment, and troubleshooting. All electrical equipment, inverters, collector system, and PV array systems would be tested prior to commencement of commercial operations.

Substations

For Projects 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, which require substations, the area for the substations would be appropriately graded and excavated to accommodate transformer equipment, the control building foundation, and oil containment area. Foundations for equipment within each approximately 1-acre substation would be constructed with reinforced concrete.

Structural components in the Project substation area would include:

- Transformers, switchgear, and safety systems; and
- Footings and oil containment system for transformers.

Interconnection Descriptions

Each inverter would be fully enclosed and pad mounted and would be approximately 90 inches in height. The AC output of two inverters would be fed via underground cable into the low-voltage side of the inverter step-up transformer, generally within 20 feet of the inverters. Each transformer would be mounted on a concrete pad and enclosed together with switchgear and a junction box. Transformers are typically 87 inches in height. The high-voltage output of the transformer would be combined in series via underground collector cables to the junction box of the nearest transformer, ranging from as little as 60 feet to as much as 700 feet. The collector system cables would be tied throughout the SGF at underground junction boxes to the main underground collector cables, which would be composed of a larger wire gauge, to the location of the generator step-up transformer ("GSU"), as applicable at each Project location. The main collector cables would rise into the low-voltage busbar and protection equipment that would be enclosed together with the GSU. The primary switchgear includes the main circuit breaker and utility metering equipment, and it would be enclosed separately but pad-mounted together with the GSU. Both the GSU and the primary switchgear would stand approximately 87 inches in height.

The output of the switchgear would be the start of the Project generation tie ("gen-tie") line. The connections from the SGFs to the regional transmission lines are made through the construction of gen-tie lines. Los Angeles County requires that all gen-tie lines be underground except when other applicable regulations require otherwise, and Projects 1 − 6 are each designed in this manner. Each gen-tie line would consist of three phases of either underground or overhead conductor and a disconnect switch. The overhead conductor would be mounted on either wooden or tubular steel poles of varying heights ranging from 55 to 85 feet. Pole height would be determined by the span between poles as defined in the final design for each Project.

Data Collection Systems

Each Project would be designed with a comprehensive Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition ("SCADA") system for remote monitoring of facility operation and/or remote control of critical components. Within the site, the fiber optic or other cabling required for the monitoring system, would be installed with the gathering line system throughout the solar field leading to a centrally located (or series of appropriately located) SCADA system cabinets. The external telecommunications connections to the SCADA system cabinets may be through either wireless or hard-wired telecommunications to a centralized data collection center.

The system would also include a permanent meteorological data collection system. The station would have several weather sensors: a pyranometer for measuring solar irradiance, a thermometer to measure air temperature, a barometric pressure sensor, and two wind sensors to measure speed and direction. These sensors would be connected to a data logger, which would compile the data for transmission to the data collection center.

Construction

Construction for each of the six Project facilities consists of three major phases: (1) site preparation, (2) PV system installation testing and startup, and (3) site cleanup/restoration. Best Management Practices ("BMPs") would be required during all construction phases of the Projects. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP") incorporating BMPs for erosion control would be prepared and approved before the start of construction. The Projects would also comply with applicable post-construction water quality standards adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board ("RWQCB").

PV System Installation

PV system installation includes earthwork, grading, and erosion control, as well as construction of the plant substation and erection of the PV modules, supports, and associated electrical equipment. System installation would begin with teams installing the steel/concrete piers support structures. The exact design would be finalized pending evaluation of soil conditions.

The proposed method of installation would be the use of vibration-driven pile foundations. This step would be followed by panel installation and electrical work. A very limited volume of concrete would be required for the substation footings, foundations, pads for the transformers, and other substation equipment. Silverado Power, LLC ("Applicant") does not propose to use excavated and poured footings or foundations for the PV arrays. Concrete would be produced at an off-site location by a local provider and transported to the Project sites by truck.

The enclosures housing the inverters have a pre-cast concrete base. Final concrete specifications would be determined during detailed design engineering consistent with applicable building codes. The primary site preparation method for the PV modules would be mowing, because the majority of the six sites are very flat with little change in topography. However, there may be a few instances where limited earthwork, including ponding area leveling of less than one foot in depth, and erosion control cultivation may be required to accommodate the placement of PV arrays. Other than required grading for roads, pads, and drainage features, and standard

trenching and installation work, no other earthwork would be performed within the array areas. Erosion control techniques used during construction may include the use of silt fencing, straw bales, temporary catch basins, inlet filters, and truck tire muck shakers. Construction of the PV arrays includes the installation of support beams, module rail assemblies, PV modules, inverters, transformers, and buried electrical cables.

Wastes generated during construction may include the following: cardboard, wood pallets, copper wire, scrap steel, common trash, and wood wire spools. The Applicant does not expect to generate hazardous waste during construction. However, field equipment used during construction would contain various hazardous materials such as hydraulic oil, diesel fuel, grease, lubricants, solvents, adhesives, paints, and other petroleum-based products contained in construction vehicles.

Operations & Maintenance

Upon commissioning, the Projects would enter the operational phase. For the duration of the operational phase, the Projects would be operated and monitored remotely by a third party contractor, with an assumed two on-site visits for security, maintenance, and system monitoring per quarter (total of eight trips per year) by two third party employees in one light duty truck, and two on-site visits by four third party employees for biannual panel washing that includes one light duty truck and one water truck. Therefore the trips would be no more than 10 trips annually for security, maintenance, system monitoring and panel washing. There would be no personnel stationed on-site full time during operations. The PV arrays would produce electricity passively with minimal moving parts; therefore, maintenance requirements would be limited. Any required planned maintenance would be scheduled to avoid peak-load periods, and unplanned maintenance would typically be responded to as needed depending on the event.

Security

To ensure the safety of the public and the facilities, the sites would be fenced and signs would be posted. Security measures would be installed as necessary to mitigate and/or deter unauthorized access. Access to the sites would be controlled and gates would be installed at the roads entering the property.

Decommissioning Plan

A Decommissioning Plan for each of the Projects would be prepared and submitted for approval to Los Angeles County prior to obtaining a grading permit. The plan would assure that the land is protected during operations and returned as closely as possible to its original state upon termination of the use of the land as a SGF. It is unknown at this time if solar energy electricity production would continue to be utilized on this land in excess of 35 years, and thus the future long-term use of the site beyond 35 years is unknown. The life of each facility is presently proposed to be 35 years. The Decommissioning Plan would be implemented in the early summer of the year or year following the time of facility closure thus allowing the site reclamation to be completed outside of the rainy season and before winter begins. In the event that a Project ceases

operations prior to completion of the 35-year estimated life of the Project, applicable provisions of the Decommissioning Plan would commence.

Section 1.1.3 Project Description—Features Unique to Project Site 2

Project 2 (Western Antelope Blue Sky Ranch) would have a generating capacity of 40 MW-AC and would be located on and be located on 157 acres of mostly disturbed land in unincorporated northern Los Angeles County. Of the 157 acres, approximately 118 acres would be developed for the purpose of solar power generation. The remaining 39 acres will not be disturbed, and are comprised of established vegetation and vacant land that will not be developed. Project 2 would operate year-round, producing electric power during daytime hours.

The power generated by the SGF would be connected to the existing SCE transmission network with the voltage transformation equipment and system safety equipment constructed on the site. Electricity would be delivered to the existing SCE Antelope Substation located near the intersection of 95th Street West and West Avenue J, via a 1.9-mile long gen-tie line originating at the DC collection system within the Project 2 site.

From the northeast corner of Project 2 site, the gen-tie line route Option 1A would be as follows: 0.02 miles underground across 110th Street West, 0.5 miles either underground or overhead along the east side of 110th Street West, either in the Lancaster public ROW or on private land, and 1.38 miles either underground or overhead along the south side of West Avenue J, either within the Lancaster public ROW or located on private land.

An alternative interconnection route, Option 1B, would be a 1-mile long gen-tie line to the proposed private Antelope-Plainview collector substation at W Avenue J and 105th Street West, which was previously approved by the City of Lancaster (City of Lancaster 2013). The gen-tie line path would be as follows: 0.02 miles underground across 110th Street West, 0.5 miles either underground or overhead along the east side of 110th Street West, either in the Lancaster public ROW or on private land, and 0.48 miles either underground or overhead along the south side of West Avenue J, either within the Lancaster public ROW or on private land.

The Antelope-Plainview collector substation would serve as a point to aggregate the generation output of multiple proposed projects in the area onto one set of conductors. Physically located at the collector substation would be steel structures to land the individual project 66 kV gen-tie lines, and combine them onto one higher capacity set of conductors. The collector substation would include the electrical system protection equipment (circuit breaker, disconnect switches, instrumentation transformers, protective relays) necessary to identify and isolate electrical faults and safely disconnect the generators from the SCE transmission system. The collector substation would also house utility revenue metering equipment, and monitoring and telecommunications equipment housed in a small control building. The monitoring equipment would aggregate key system data (MW produced, Megavolt Ampere Reactive ("MVAR") produced, status of protective devices, voltage level) from the PV system for delivery to the SCE system via the diverse telecommunication circuits.

A separate, previously approved gen-tie line would connect the Antelope-Plainview collector substation (City of Lancaster 2013) to the SCE Antelope Substation. Electricity from multiple

projects would be delivered to the existing SCE Antelope Substation via a 0.9 mile gen-tie line originating at the collector substation. The gen-tie line would be located along the south side of West Avenue J, either within the public ROW or located on private land. The gen-tie line would be overhead or underground from the collector substation to an area near the high voltage transmission lines approximately 700 feet east of 100th St. West. From this location, the gen-tie line would be located underground where it would ultimately interconnect into the SCE Antelope Substation. The overhead portion of the gen-tie line would consist of multiple conductors mounted on either tubular steel or wooden poles, which would be approximately 55 to 85 feet in height. The proposed and permitted Antelope-Plainview collector substation and 0.9 mile gen-tie to the existing Antelope substation have undergone CEQA review by the City of Lancaster, (City of Lancaster 2013) and are not further analyzed in the EIR prepared for Projects 1-6.

The gen-tie line route for Project 2 would traverse land use designation N-1 in the County of Los Angeles. Within the City of Lancaster, the gen-tie line route would traverse land use designations Non-Urban Residential (NU) and Urban Residential (UR). In July 2013, the City of Lancaster approved a General Plan Amendment for the UR designation to NU designation for another applicant's solar project that the gen-tie line would traverse, to connect to the Antelope Substation. An agreement with the City of Lancaster will be obtained by the Applicant for the gen-tie line that would traverse through this jurisdiction. This agreement will grant right-of-way privileges for the proposed gen-tie line.

Project 2 Telecommunications Lines

Fiber optic cable will run along the gen-tie line from the Project 2 site to the SCE Antelope Substation. If the alternative interconnection plan is selected, two fiber optic cables between the proposed Antelope-Plainview collector substation (City of Lancaster 2013) and the Antelope Substation would be constructed to provide protective relay circuits, SCADA circuits, data, and telephone services. A dedicated broadband connection from a local provider will be secured at the Project 2 site.

Project 2 Construction

Project 2 construction is expected to last approximately 8 months, beginning with site preparation through equipment setup and commencement of commercial operation. Site preparation and construction for Project 2 is expected to occur between the first and third quarters of 2014. The on-site workforce would consist of laborers, electricians, supervisory personnel, support personnel, and construction management personnel. Construction would generally occur during daylight hours, Monday through Friday. Construction activities would be conducted consistent with Los Angeles County regulations regarding hours of construction.

The expected construction water use for Project 2 is 94 acre feet, which would be trucked to this site from a private provider of out of Basin or other authorized water. Construction water needs would be limited to soil conditioning and dust suppression. Potable water would be brought to the Project 2 site for drinking and domestic needs.

Project 2 Operations

No personnel would be stationed at the facility and no occupied structures would be built on the site. Full and part-time positions over the life of the Project would be required for periodic operation and maintenance activities, and would be performed by a third-party contractor. Operational water requirements would be 5.8 acre feet per year ("AFY").

Section 1.1.4 Discretionary Actions Required for Project 2

Implementation of Project 2 will require the following discretionary approval action by the County:

- **Conditional Use Permit ("CUP")**: To authorize the construction and operation of a solar photovoltaic electricity generating plant on 157 acres and installation of a water tank in the A-2-5 Zone. The project meets the definition of "electric generating plant" in the Los Angeles County Zoning Code. Pursuant to Section 22.24.150, electric generating plants are a use subject to a conditional use permit in the A-2 Zone.

Section 1.1.5 Statement of Project Objectives

Together, proposed Projects 1 – 6 would meet the existing and future demand for electricity generated from clean, renewable technology by generating 172 MW of electrical energy from the sun. Recent legislation enacted in California recognizes the multiple benefits associated with the development of renewable energy resources. These benefits include a reduced reliance on fossil fuel, diversification of energy portfolios, reductions in greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions, and the creation of "green" jobs within the state of California. Additionally, the Projects would assist California in meeting the newly established Renewable Energy Portfolio Standards ("RPS"). Senate Bill 14 established RPS targets for California, stating: "All retail sellers of electricity shall serve 33 percent of their load with renewable energy by 2020." State government agencies have been directed to take all appropriate actions to implement this target in all regulatory proceedings, including siting, permitting, and procurement for renewable energy power plants and transmission lines.

Each of the six proposed PV Project sites, including Project 2, qualify as eligible renewable energy resources as defined by the California Public Resources Code, and would help the State meet the objective of increasing renewable energy generation. In addition, Projects 1-6 would contribute much-needed competitive energy during peak power periods to the electrical grid in California.

As another key objective, Projects 1-6 have each been sited to minimize impacts to the environment and the local community as follows:

- Using disturbed land or land that has been previously degraded from prior use;
- Using existing electrical distribution facilities, rights-of-way, roads, and other existing infrastructure where feasible to minimize the need for new electrical support facilities; and

- Minimizing impacts to threatened or endangered species or their habitats, wetlands and waters of the United States, cultural resources, and sensitive land uses.

SECTION 1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT PROCESS

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, the County completed an Initial Study (June 13, 2012) for the proposed Project, and determined that an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") was required. A Notice of Preparation ("NOP"), including the Initial Study was circulated to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, responsible, trustee, and interested agencies, and key interest groups beginning June 20, 2012 to solicit comments on the proposed content of the Draft EIR. The NOP was circulated for the required 30-day comment period which ended July 20, 2012. A Scoping Meeting was held on July 14, 2012 at the Lancaster Library located at 601 West Lancaster Boulevard in Lancaster, California, to facilitate public review and comment on the Project.

The Draft EIR includes the Initial Study, the comment letters received during the public review period in response to the NOP, and a transcript of verbal comments received during the Scoping Meeting (see Draft EIR Appendix A-1 to A-5). All NOP comments relating to the EIR were reviewed and the issues raised in those comments were addressed, to the extent feasible, in the Draft EIR.

Potentially significant environmental impacts addressed in the Draft EIR include Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Public Services, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. The Draft EIR analyzed both Project-level and cumulative effects of the Project on these topics and identified a variety of mitigation measures to minimize, reduce, avoid, or compensate for the potential adverse effects of the proposed Project.

The Draft EIR also analyzed five potential alternatives to the proposed Project, including: 1) No Project Alternative; 2) Lower Intensity Projects; 3) Select Other Project Sites; 4) Rooftop Solar Generation; and 5) Wind Energy Generation. Potential environmental impacts of each of these alternatives were discussed at the CEQA-prescribed level of detail and comparisons were made to the proposed Project.

The Initial Study determined that the Project would result in less than significant or no impact to several environmental resource areas:

1) **Mineral Resources**: The Project would not have the potential to result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region, including those identified in a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

2) **Employment, Population & Housing**: The Project would provide significant short-term employment for construction workers during the two year construction period. The

duration of construction for the Projects would be less than two years; and construction personnel would commute to the Projects from Lancaster, the Los Angeles areas, and Kern County. However, jobs would be temporary and would be for the two year construction period. Construction workers would not establish new households and are not anticipated to permanently relocate to the area. Additionally, adequate construction personnel presently living in Los Angeles and Kern County would fill all of the jobs that will be available. Area population, housing demands and the need for educational facilities and libraries would not be affected significantly because jobs that would be created are short term in nature; therefore, they would not be impacted by the Projects. Employment, Population, and Housing would not be impacted because the Projects do not require a significant number of personnel to operate them once they are built and producing electricity, and they do not have growth inducing impacts to the local community. Requirements for operations and maintenance are not significant and would be conducted by a few specialized contracted third-party personnel who will cover the Projects. There is no operations and maintenance building on any of the Projects 1-6.

3) **Recreation**: The Project would have no impact on recreation opportunities in the area. There are adequate recreation opportunities in the area, and the availability of these would not change as a result of the Project.

Following the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("LACDRP") internal departmental review and analysis of the proposed Project through the screencheck process, the Draft EIR was submitted to the State Clearinghouse, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, and circulated for public review period beginning January 6, 2014. The 45-day public review period required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15087 ended on February 19, 2014.
A public hearing was held before the County's Hearing Examiner to take public testimony on the Draft EIR, at Lancaster Library located at 601 West Lancaster Boulevard in Lancaster, California, held at 1:00 p.m. on February 1, 2014. Approximately 80 people attended the Hearing Examiner meeting, and 26 attendees provided oral comments on the Draft EIR. A transcript of the oral comments made at the Hearing Examiner Meeting is contained in Section 2.0 of the Final EIR.

SECTION 1.3 PROJECT FINDINGS INTRODUCTION

The Findings made by the County, pursuant to Section 21081 of CEQA, and Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, on the consideration of Project 2 of the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project in unincorporated Los Angeles County, California are presented below. All potentially significant impacts of the Project identified in the Final EIR are included herein, and are organized according to the resources affected.

The Findings in this document are for Project 2 of the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project, and are supported by information and analysis from the Final EIR and other evidence in the administrative record.

For each significant impact, a Finding has been made as to one or more of the following, in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091:

A. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects on the environment.

B. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.

A narrative of supporting facts follows the appropriate Finding. For all of the impacts, one or more of the findings above have been made. The proposed Project will not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts.

SECTION 2.0 FINDINGS REGARDING POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH ARE NOT SIGNIFICANT OR WHICH HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

All Final EIR mitigation measures, as set forth in the MMRP (attached as Exhibit A to these findings) have been incorporated by reference into the conditions of approval for Project 2. These mitigation measures and conditions of approval will result in a substantial mitigation of the effects of Project 2, such that the effects are not significant or have been mitigated to a level of less than significant. Specifically, the Commission has determined, based on the Final EIR, that Project 2 design features, mitigation measures, and conditions of approval will reduce Project impacts concerning Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Public Services, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems to a level of less than significant.

2.1 AESTHETICS

Potential Effect:

Project 2 would have significant visual impacts to the Project area if it had a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; would be visible from, or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail; substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features; or create a new source of substantial light or glare which will adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 2 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Aesthetics.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are no designated scenic highways in the vicinity of the Project 2 site. The proposed SGFs would not substantially damage or impact scenic resources such as trees (including Joshua trees) or rock outcroppings, and there are no historic buildings located in the proposed site. **(DEIR at 4.1-105)**. The California Poppy Trail, an adopted proposed multiple-use County trail, runs parallel to the Project 2 site along 110th Street West. A County-designated Class III bikeway is also located along 110th Street West. The bikeway is located adjacent to the eastern boundary of Project 2 for approximately 0.5 mile. West Avenue K, which was identified in the City of Lancaster's MEA as a potential scenic route, is located southeast of the Project site. West Avenue K has no official designation as a scenic route at this time. **(DEIR at 4.1-27)**.

The proposed Project 2 site is vacant land in a rural area, and is typical of the surrounding landscape. The visual quality of the Project site is low. The Project site itself does not have unique or rare features, or hold special significance. The topography is rolling to flat, sloping upwards towards the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains. Vegetation is uniform and consists of grasses and short shrubs. No permanent water features occur on the site, and there are no features or characteristics that set the Project site apart from the surrounding landscape. No designated trails are located on the Project 2 site; therefore the Project and gen-tie line would not cause the vacation of any portion of any trail. Because the solar modules are low-profile, the Project would not obstruct expansive views. **(DEIR at 4.1-101; 4.1-106)**.

It is highly unlikely that the Project 2 SGF would be discernible from Little Buttes or Quartz Hill, which are both located over six miles from the site. Even though viewpoints from Little Buttes and Quartz Hill are at higher elevations than the Project site, from this distance the proposed Project would fade into the flat landscape. The SGF would be visible from certain locations in the Foothills Area, including portions of the California Aqueduct trails, and may be visible from the California Poppy Reserve. **(DEIR at 4.1-27)**.

Construction activities and equipment on the Project 2 site would be noticeable from vistas in the Foothills area and West Avenue K where not screened by topography and/or vegetation. During construction of the SGF, disturbance areas would appear as large patches of fine, buff-colored rock and soil. Construction activities may produce visible dust but impacts would be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of the fugitive dust plan or Mitigation Measure A-1. Any trash, debris, and waste would be removed from the Project 2 site during construction, and the site will be screened or partially screened by fencing as required by Mitigation Measures A-2 and A-3. Adverse visual effects from construction would be temporary and last only during the construction time period, and would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures A-1, A-2, and A-3. **(DEIR at 4.1-94)**.

A post-construction visual simulation of Project 2 (DEIR Figure 4.1-32) was developed from a viewpoint in the Foothills Area. The overall level of contrast introduced by Project 2 was evaluated as low from this viewpoint. The Project 2 site is screened by terrain from many viewpoints, and no noticeable modifications to landforms are anticipated. Vegetation removal would be screened by the installation of solar modules. The introduction of solar modules would create a low contrast in form, line, color, and texture from existing conditions. The horizontal lines and colors of the solar field mimic those found in the existing environment. Project 2, including the gen-tie line, would not dominate views from the trail given the degree of modification that has already been introduced to the landscape, including roads, electrical infrastructure (existing PV solar fields, transmission lines, substations, and distribution lines, and because Project 2 would be largely screened by rolling terrain that exists between the trail and the Project 2 site. The Project 2 site may be more noticeable from higher elevations in the Foothills area where not screened by terrain, but overall impacts to this viewpoint are less than significant.

A second post-construction photographic simulation was completed from a viewpoint at the intersection of 110th Street West and West Avenue K (DEIR Figure 4.1-33). The photo simulation provided in Figure 4.1-33 was taken adjacent to the Project 2 site on the opposite side of 110th Street West. The overall level of contrast introduced by Project 2 was evaluated as moderate from this viewpoint. The SGF would not obstruct views to or from any scenic resources, because of the low profile of the solar modules. The rows of modules mimic the horizontal lines of the flat landscape, and repeat colors that already exist in the existing environment. Contrast is rated at moderate due to the prominence of the solar panels in the immediate foreground. A 10-foot vegetative buffer is proposed along 110th Street West to mitigate views from West Avenue K (Mitigation Measure A-4), the California Poppy Trail, and the Class III bikeway, which will reduce this impact to less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.1-95)**.

Project 2 construction activities may produce dust that is visible in the distance, but impacts would be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of the fugitive dust plan. Construction activities and equipment would be noticeable to trail users in the foothills area where the Project 2 site and associated gen-tie line are not screened by terrain. Construction activities may produce visible dust, but impacts would be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of the fugitive dust plan. Adverse visual effects from construction would be temporary and last only during the construction time period, and would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.1-101)**.

Even where visible, the proposed Project 2 components would not be a dominant element in the landscape unless the viewer was directly adjacent to the facility. From viewing points further than approximately 0.25 mile from the solar field, at approximately the same elevation, the solar facility would fade into the flat landscape and not dominate the view. Project 2 is not out-of-character when considering the context of the surrounding landscape. Rural development and public infrastructure are common in the landscape around the Project 2 site, which is situated approximately 1.5 miles north/northeast of the Antelope Substation and within two miles of existing PV solar facilities. Several distribution lines and high-voltage transmission lines converge at the Antelope Substation. Other modifications to the landscape include farms and residences. Because other structures and PV facilities are common in the vicinity of the Project 2

site and in the larger Project area, and because the Project 2 site itself is not characterized by high visual quality, the visual impact of the Project on the existing visual character of the proposed Project site and its surroundings would be less than significant with mitigation. **(DEIR at 4.1-107)**.

Project 2's visual impacts are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

A-1 A Fugitive Dust Control Plan to minimize dust (visual pollution) shall be prepared and implemented.

A-2 The Project site shall be maintained free of debris, trash, and waste during construction.

A-3 The Project site shall be visually screened or partially screened during construction by fencing.

A-4 A landscape plan shall be developed for each Project prior to Project construction that shows the detail of a 10-foot wide screening vegetation buffer intended to screen or partially screen the Project visually from area residents or travelers on nearby roadways.

A-5 All lighting shall comply with applicable provisions of the Los Angeles County Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Lights shall be limited to types allowed by the ordinance, installed below maximum allowed heights, pointed downwards and shielded to minimize light trespass, and mounted on essential infrastructure rather than on separate light poles except where poles are required by regulation or by governing agency. Lighting will comply with the hours of operation requirements in the ordinance, and utilize automatic control devices to comply with time limits except where permitted by Los Angeles County. Lighting will be maintained in good repair at all times.

2.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 2 would have a significant impact on Agriculture and Forestry Resources if it would: convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use; conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract; conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)); result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or 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.

Finding:

Project 2 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Agriculture and Forestry Resources. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

As currently mapped under 2010 data from the Department of Conservation ("DOC") Farmland Monitoring and Mapping Program ("FMMP"), the Project 2 site contains no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. **(DEIR at 4.2-5)**. Project 2 also contains no forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. **(DEIR at 4.2-8)**.

Project 2 is located within the Los Angeles County Zoning Ordinance designation A-2, Heavy Agriculture. According to LACDRP, a solar electricity energy generating facility is allowed in Zone A-2 with the issuance of a CUP (Chapter 22.24.150[A]). Furthermore, Project 2 will not preclude future agricultural uses. Project 2 and its associated gen-tie lines are located within a LACDRP Agricultural Opportunity Area ("AOA"). The Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan Policy states that these areas should be protected from incompatible uses. The Antelope Valley Area Plan states that applications for non-agricultural uses in the AOA areas will be evaluated for their impact upon adjacent agricultural operations.

Project 2 would involve conversion of land that was formerly used for agricultural production to renewable electricity energy production. Construction and operation of Project 2 would not involve other restrictions, obstructions, or resources that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. Project 2 has no recorded history of irrigated agricultural land. The Project would produce power in a passive manner and would result in minimal air pollutant emissions, traffic, and noise, and would not affect adjacent agricultural operations.

Project 2 and its associated gen-tie lines are located in an AOA, but are not currently utilized for agricultural purposes. Additionally, the proposed properties are not designated under a Williamson Act contract. As a result, construction and operation of Project 2 would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, impacts to existing agricultural use zoning, designated AOAs, and Williamson Act contracts will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-7)**.

Project 2 and its associated gen-tie lines will temporarily preclude future agricultural use at the Project 2 site. Following the termination of power generating activities at the Project 2 site, all facilities and equipment would be removed and the land would be restored as near to its pre-development condition as possible in the event a new similar land use is not contemplated at that time by then current owners. A decommissioning and reclamation plan detailing land restoration activities will be provided, as required by Los Angeles County as part of the CUP. Additionally, the Applicant will be required to provide a decommissioning bond, or other suitable financial guarantee acceptable to the County, equal to the amount of money estimated to be required to decommission the Project, including any additional environmental review which might become necessary, and restore the land to as near its pre-development condition as possible. Project 2

will not impact any land use outside the development site's limits. Impacts regarding the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-9)**.

2.3 AIR QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Project 2 would have a significant impact on Air Quality if it would: conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; cumulatively produce a considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors); expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 2 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Air Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Pursuant to the Clean Air Act ("CAA"), the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District ("AVAQMD") is required to reduce project emissions of criteria pollutants for which the Mojave Desert Air Basin ("MDAB") is in non-attainment. Project 2 is located within a non-attainment area, which means that certain Project-related activities could potentially be subject to emission control strategies contained within the AVAQMD Federal 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan. Construction would involve activities that can result in emissions of particulate matter ("PM"). However, construction of PV panels and the generation-tie line would not require intense earthmoving activities, only the low-impact method of mowing the surface. Compliance with applicable rules, ordinances, plans, and policies would minimize PM emissions during construction. Project 2 construction emissions would not exceed emission thresholds, and would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-25)**. Since construction of Projects 1-6 would occur consecutively over the course of two years, construction of the six Projects could overlap, which may cause a peak in the Projects' daily construction emissions. However, maximum daily and annual construction emissions would not exceed the appropriate AVAQMD significant thresholds for all pollutants, even with the potential overlap in construction schedules. **(DEIR at 4.3-37)**.

During operation of Project 2, the Project site would undergo maintenance and security activities no more than 10 times annually (as needed), and would not create a daily increase in population or visitors. The assumption of 10 annual trips includes truck trips associated with panel washing. Project 2 would comply with AVAQMD rules and Los Angeles County ordinances, and is designed to be consistent with applicable county policies and the Attainment Plan. Therefore, Project 2 would not conflict with implementing the applicable air quality plan. **(DEIR at 4.3-25)**.

Project 2 emissions estimates are based on compliance with AVAQMD Rule 403 requirements for fugitive dust suppression, watering exposed surfaces two times daily. The short-term emissions during Project 2 construction would not exceed AVAQMD significance thresholds. As such, Project 2 would not exceed thresholds, result in violating air quality standards, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. **(DEIR at 4.3-27)**. Likewise, even when all six Projects operate concurrently, the operation of all six Projects would not exceed annual thresholds, violate air quality standards, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. **(DEIR at 4.3-42)**.

Decommissioning of Project 2 (and each of the six Project sites) would require removal of the PV modules, PV module mounting system, electrical boxes, electrical inverters and transformers, electrical AC collection system, switchgear, data monitoring equipment, chain link perimeter security fencing, concrete ballasts, underground vaults, other concrete pads, and transporting all components off site. Air quality emissions from decommissioning would be generated from the pieces of equipment used and any fugitive dust from site preparation activities. Equipment used for decommissioning and removal of concrete ballasts, underground vaults, concrete pads, etc. generally would be similar to that used for construction, except that no mowing or clearing would be required.

Since decommissioning does not involve mowing or clearing activities, the level of fugitive dust emissions would be less than emissions created during construction. After removal of equipment and facilities, the site would need to be re-vegetated. Decommissioning would occur after at least 25 years of operation; therefore, equipment engine technology is likely to be more advanced, and fuels to be cleaner. Criteria pollutant emissions during decommissioning would be equal to or, more likely, less than those estimated from construction for Project 2, and will also be less than significant with mitigation. **(DEIR at 4.3-42)**. Similar to criteria pollutant emissions, hazardous air pollutant emissions during decommissioning would be less than during construction due to advanced equipment engine technology and cleaner fuel and would therefore be less than significant. Exhaust from off-road equipment and on-road vehicles used during decommissioning and construction truck trips would not be expected to create objectionable odors, and would therefore be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-42).**

The MDAB is currently nonattainment for federal and state ozone standards and nonattainment for state PM_{10} standards, which may cause emissions from Project 2 to contribute to an existing or projected air quality standard exceedance. Implementing any of the six Projects (including Project 2) would increase short-term emissions related to construction, and a negligible increase in long-term emissions related to SGF operation and maintenance. Construction for all six sites is expected to be staggered, and may extend over two years. Nevertheless, due to the nature and size of each site, simultaneous construction would not result in emissions of ozone precursors or PM_{10} that exceed daily thresholds. As shown in DEIR Table 4.3-12, “Mitigated Peak Daily Concurrent Construction Emissions”, and DEIR Table 4.3-13, “Peak Annual Concurrent Construction Emissions”, the impacts would be less than significant prior to mitigation. Implementing control strategies to reduce PM_{10} further minimizes air emissions. As such, construction of Project 2 would not 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). **(DEIR at 4.3-43)**.

During the operation phase, Project 2 will have no major emissions sources. Facility operating equipment that emits regulated air pollutants or requires AVAQMD permits is not planned at Project 2 or any of the six Project sites. As shown in DEIR Table 4.3-20, "Peak Annual Concurrent Operation Emissions", the impacts would be less than significant. As such, operation of Project 2 would not 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). **(DEIR at 4.3-43)**.

Project 2 was analyzed for air impacts to nearby sensitive receptors; however, sensitive receptors would only be exposed during construction activities. PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations are expected to occur primarily from fugitive dust emissions during mowing, excavation activities and, to a lesser degree, during PV installation and paving. Rule 401 requires that airborne particles remain on the site from which they originate under normal wind conditions. Proper mitigation techniques must be implemented to ensure that fugitive dust is contained. Emissions are not expected to expose even the closest sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and, due to the distance between Project sites, simultaneous construction at two sites would not significantly impact the same sensitive receptors. **(DEIR at 4.3-44)**.

Operational emissions from Project 2 would not impact local air pollutant levels at nearby receptors. As mentioned above, sensitive receptors would only be exposed, if at all, during construction activities. The primary source of Project emissions during operation is the vehicles used by facility maintenance staff traveling to and from the site. Maintenance is expected to occur no more than 10 times per year. Overall, Project 2 would not result in an increase in VMT over the course of one summer or winter day. Thus, Project 2 would not result in new long-term stationary sources, nor would they result in a significant number of net new vehicular trips. Carbon monoxide (CO) impacts from operation of Project 2 to sensitive receptors would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-44)**.

Short-term concentration levels during the construction phase will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, including those resulting in a cancer risk greater than the EPA screening levels. **(DEIR at 4.3-45)**. Due to continuous construction of each of the six Project sites over the course of two years (which may overlap), long-term cancer impacts from construction activities to the nearest sensitive receptors were evaluated, and found that even with the cumulative contribution of health risk impacts from all six proposed Projects, the cumulative cancer risk to the identified sensitive receptors is still below the cancer risk exposure level. **(DEIR at 4.3-46)**. Short-term concentration levels during Project 2 site construction will neither expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, nor exceed the cancer risk screening levels. **(DEIR at 4.3-47)**.

Project 2's Air Quality impacts are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

AQ-1 Water active sites at least twice daily (locations where soil disturbance is to occur would be thoroughly watered before earthmoving) during construction, or, in locations where water alone does not suffice to suppress dust adequately apply nontoxic chemical soil

stabilizers, according to manufacturers' specifications. Temporarily stockpiled soil shall be secured with tarps or plastic sheeting or sprayed with non-toxic soil stabilizers.

AQ-2 All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).

AQ-3 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.

AQ-4 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not idle more than five minutes in any one hour.

AQ-5 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operation of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.

AQ-6 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.

AQ-7 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.

AQ-8 During array area preparation, mowing shall be used instead of grading and/or disking, and shall be limited to no more than 3.5 acres per day per site to further reduce dust emissions during construction.

AQ-9 All interior roads shall use long-lasting non-toxic chemical soil stabilizers designed for long-term dust stabilization on dirt roads.

AQ-10 Interior array areas shall have re-established pre-existing vegetation or be established with drought tolerant, native, or native compatible vegetation approved by the County biologist and compliant with Fire Department requirements, within two years of energization authorization of an array area by the Department of Public Works, Building and Safety Division, to provide long-term dust stabilization under the arrays.

AQ-11 Earth disturbing activities shall be suspended and/or additional water shall be applied to meet Rule 403 criteria if wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour.

AQ-12 Construction activity shall utilize electricity from power poles on or adjacent to the Project sites rather than use of temporary diesel power generators and/or gasoline power generators when electricity with adequate circuit capacity is available from power poles in proximity to construction areas.

AQ-13 In the event temporary night lighting is necessary for construction or maintenance purposes, lighting not requiring the use of diesel or gasoline driven generators shall be used.

2.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 2 would have a significant impact on biological resources if it would: 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 Wildlife ("CDFW") or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ("USFWS"); have a substantial adverse effect on sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations of CDFW or USFWS; have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including marshes, vernal pools, and coastal wetlands) or waters of the United States, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; 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; convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, southern California black walnut, etc.); conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas ("SEAs") (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Section 22.56.215), and the Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas ("SERAs"), (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Section 22.44, Part 6); or conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 2 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Biological Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 2 does not contain riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, wetlands, Joshua trees, or yucca trees on the site, and does not contain non-jurisdictional or state regulated waters. **(DEIR at 4.4-59)**. There are also no wetlands, vernal pools, or riparian habitat identified on the Project 2 site. No federally protected wetlands (including marshes, vernal pools, and coastal wetlands) or waters of the United States, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act

features, were identified on the Project 2 site. The Project 2 site slopes from an elevation of 2,724 feet on the southeast corner to 2,589 feet on the northeast corner creating moderate slopes for runoff. Thus, drainages are evident and were identified within the Project 2 site, but these drainages do not provide wetlands or riparian habitat. The habitat in the drainage is not substantially different than the surrounding land, and impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.4-60)**.

Project 2 does not contain oak trees, juniper trees, Joshua trees, or other unique native trees. **(DEIR at 4.4-62)**. Project 2 and the immediate vicinity do not contain or conflict with any Significant Ecological Areas ("SEAs"), Wildflower Reserve Areas, or Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas ("SERAs"). The closest SEAs to Project 2 are Portal Ridge-Liebre Mountain which is 3.12 miles west, Fairmont and Antelope Buttes which are 4.16 miles south, and the Ritter ridge SEA which is 6.9 miles southeast. Therefore, Project 2 would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. **(DEIR at 4.4-63)**. There are no adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plans in effect within the boundaries of the Project 2 site. **(DEIR at 4.4-64)**.

Project 2 has low potential for ferruginous and Swainson's hawk, loggerhead shrike, merlin, and mountain plover to occur onsite. There is moderate potential for coast horned lizard and American badger to occur, and relatively high potential for burrowing owl to occur on the Project 2 site (burrowing owl was observed adjacent to the Project study area during 2013 targeted surveys). Developing the Project 2 site as a solar generating facility would remove habitat for these species, and would result in a significant impact. Mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to less than significant; however, the 118 acres of land to be developed for Project 2 would be mostly unavailable as wildlife habitat during the life of Project 2. **(DEIR at 4.4-57)**.

Valley needlegrass grasslands were identified on portions of the Project 2 site. Valley needlegrass grasslands are considered a sensitive vegetation type by CDFW, and are protected by the City of Lancaster and Los Angeles County. Mitigation lands being selected would replace the lost Valley Needlegras habitat, and efforts to reseed this plant on site would also be undertaken by including these seeds in the land reclamation seed mix.

Project 2 is located within an area of topographically homogeneous open space, and there are no local constraints to movement of resident or migratory wildlife that development of Project 2 would further aggravate. There are no known wildlife migration pathways that would be impacted by Project 2. **(DEIR 4.4-61)**.

Wildlife nursery areas on the Project 2 site may include nesting sites of native bird species, which are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-712; Ch. 128; July 13, 1918; 40 Stat. 755) and the California Fish and Game Code Section 3503. Burrowing owls may have suitable burrows on the Project 2 site, and protections for bird nesting and burrowing owls are provided in Mitigation Measures B-1, B-2, B-3 and B-4. The intent of acquiring mitigation lands would be to select available parcels that would replace lost breeding/foraging/winter foraging habitat and enhance the overall quality of habitat for a variety of species including migratory bird species. The potential to acquire parcels that would also

maintain or enhance wildlife migration corridors in the area would also be considered. Planting of shrubs and native vegetation on the Project 2 site would improve the opportunities for shrub-nesting bird species on the Project 2 site when it is complete. **(DEIR 4.4-61)**.

Project 2 impacts to Biological Resources are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

B-1: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a qualified biologist shall be retained by the Applicant as the lead biological monitor subject to the approval of the LACDRP and CDFW. That person shall ensure that impacts to all biological resources are minimized or avoided, and shall conduct (or supervise) pre-grading field surveys for species that may be avoided, affected, or eliminated as a result of grading or any other site preparation activities. The lead biological monitor shall ensure that all surveys are conducted by qualified personnel (e.g. avian biologists for bird surveys, herpetologists for reptile surveys, etc.) and that they possess all necessary permits and memoranda of understanding with the appropriate agencies for the handling of potentially-occurring special-status species. The lead biological monitor shall also ensure that daily monitoring reports (e.g., survey results, protective actions, results of protective actions, adaptive measures, etc.) are prepared, and shall make these monitoring reports available to LACDRP and CDFW at their request.

B-2: Pre-Construction surveys will be conducted prior to ground disturbance at each project site. These surveys will include all special-status species identified as having the potential to be present on the project site; including, but not limited to, badger, kit fox, southern grasshopper mouse, and the species listed below.

Pre-survey information gathering will include review of all available agency nest data and mapping.

- A focused pre-construction Swainson's hawk survey shall be conducted to locate any nesting sites within 5 miles of Projects 1 – 6. If Swainson's hawks or their active nests are located within 500 feet of the project sites, all construction-related work shall be postponed and CDFW will be consulted.

- Project-related activities likely to have the potential of disturbing suitable bird nesting habitat, which includes ground nesting birds, shall be prohibited from February 1 through August 31, unless a qualified monitoring biologist conducts nesting bird surveys prior to any construction-related disturbance to confirm the absence of active bird nests or bird nesting habitat. Disturbance shall be defined as any activity that physically removes or damages vegetation or habitat or any action that may cause disruption of nesting behavior such as loud noise from equipment or artificial night lighting. Surveys shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. If an active bird nest is discovered, disturbance within 500 feet for raptors shall be postponed until the nest is vacated, offspring are independent of the nest area and there is no evidence of further attempts at nesting. Limits of avoidance shall be marked with high-visibility flagging or fencing. The Applicant shall

record the results of the recommended protective measures and submit the records to LACDRP and CDFW to document compliance with applicable state and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds.

- A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted on each site prior to grading. Pre-construction surveys for burrowing owl shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. The surveys shall follow the protocols set forth by the California Burrowing Owl Consortium (1993 and 2012).

  If burrowing owls are found during the pre-construction survey, then replacement burrows and habitat must be provided prior to the commencement of construction. The Applicant shall be prepared to provide artificial replacement burrows in the event that owls are detected, either as wintering or breeding individuals.

  Wintering individuals may be evicted with the use of exclusion devices followed by a period of seven days to ensure that animals have left their burrows. When it can be assured that owls are no longer using the burrows, the burrows can be hand-excavated and collapsed under the supervision of the avian biologist.

  Breeding owls must not be disturbed and must be allowed to complete the raising of young until the fledglings can forage independently of adults and it can be confirmed that further attempts at nesting shall not be undertaken. When this has been confirmed, the owls can be evicted as described above for wintering animals.

- Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for special-status ground-dwelling reptiles, including but not limited to coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard. Surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground 4 to 6 weeks in advance of the survey effort, checking weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles or other species determined important by the qualified biological monitor (i.e., biologist must be appropriately permitted for collection and relocation activities) occurring within the work area prior to the start of work shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.

B-3: During grading, earthmoving activities, and other construction activities the biological monitor shall be present to inspect and enforce all mitigation requirements and to relocate any species that may come into harm's way to an appropriate offsite location of similar habitat. The biological monitor shall be authorized to stop specific grading or construction activities if violations of mitigation measures or any local, state, or federal laws are suspected. The biological monitor shall file a report of the monitoring activities with LACDRP and CDFW during construction activities, as frequently as required by LACDRP and CDFW. If ongoing biological monitoring of construction activities reveals the presence of any special-status reptiles within an active work area, then work shall be temporarily halted until the animals can be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones. Work areas shall be surveyed for special-status reptile species, such as the coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard, during construction

activities. During the construction, surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground in appropriate work areas and checking them weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles occurring within the work area shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.

B-4: Mitigation lands shall be acquired for Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, special-status migratory and wintering birds, and alkali mariposa lily.

Swainson's hawk: Impacts due to development of the projects shall be mitigated by the acquisition of good quality Swainson's hawk habitat targeted within the Antelope Valley. Land shall be purchased or placed in a conservation easement or other suitable deed restriction and managed to maintain suitable habitat in perpetuity.

The proposed development is not expected to result in the "take" of Swainson's hawk; however, the Applicant shall be required to consult CDFW in the event of take, which may result in additional mitigation prescribed by CDFW. Although the Projects are not expected to result in "take" of Swainson's hawk, mitigation will still be required to alleviate the effects of cumulative impacts on raptor, migratory bird, and burrowing owl habitats:

Replacement land will be provided based on the quality of the mitigation land relative to the impacted habitat. The ratio of such replacement shall be determined as follows:

- A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 3 acres of development if the replacement land is superior nesting and foraging habitat contiguous to occupied nesting and foraging habitat, and is within a designated or proposed SEA.

- A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 2 acres of development if the replacement land is unoccupied irrigated land, contiguous to occupied habitat and providing superior quality foraging habitat with trees or other such nesting habitat;

- A ratio of 1 acre of replacement land for each acre of development if the replacement land provides similar foraging and nesting habitat.

Burrowing Owl: Mitigation for any occupied burrowing owl burrows found during preconstruction surveys will include a comprehensive tiered approach:

- Pre-construction and construction monitoring surveys conducted by a qualified biologist to detect potential new owl activity onsite;

- Disturbance avoidance of occupied burrows during nesting period February 1 – August 31;

- Impact avoidance of occupied burrows;

- Burrow exclusion and closure and offsite relocation (>100 m), as described previously in in B-2, will be conducted for unavoidable impacts to occupied burrows (after consultation with CDFW).

- Minimizing impacts by protecting in-place any owls, their burrows, and their immediate habitat by establishing setback zones and visual screens for burrows adjacent to construction activity; by placing visible markers, and by conducting construction worker awareness training. Setback widths will be applied as appropriate to the level of existing disturbance and owl stage of activity (e.g., for low to moderate construction-related disturbance activity outside the nesting season near burrows in currently high-traffic or disturbance areas, it is assumed owls are adapted to human disturbance and will not need a large setback).

- Mitigating unavoidable impacts to habitat: restore temporary impacts to pre-existing conditions; replace nesting/occupied and satellite burrows lost with the same number of suitable burrows on the mitigation site. Mitigation acreage for foraging habitat provided for Swainson's hawk will be sufficient to replace lost burrowing owl habitat because the hawk's replacement habitat will be in-kind or better (i.e., the Project habitat is low quality overall and mitigation habitat will be at least the same quality as the lost habitat OR will have higher quality habitat features overall, such as increased vegetative structure, higher numbers of prey species, less disturbance, and less potential for predation by domestic animals, etc.). Specific habitat considerations as provided in the CDFW 2012 burrowing owl guidance will be considered in selecting the overall habitat replacement acres for the project.

Alkali Mariposa Lily: Alkali mariposa lily will be avoided to the greatest extent possible. If preconstruction surveys reveal individuals that cannot be avoided, mitigation of lost alkali mariposa lily shall be provided at a minimum 1:1 ratio. This acreage will be calculated with input from LACDRP and CDFW. Additionally, because alkali mariposa Lilies have locally available seed sources, plantings of the lilies on appropriate soil types on Projects shall be implemented in selected areas. The lilies may also be transplanted from areas planned for disturbance to more suitable locations in the Project area. Transplantation locations must be situated within adequately buffered areas to be found suitable.

For all species the mitigation acreage may be located within the Project sites, but outside of the area of development, subject to LACDRP and CDFW approval, if acreage of sufficient quantity and quality exists.

B-5: Review and Approval of Habitat Management Lands Prior to Acquisition: The Applicant shall provide a mitigation land acquisition proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for their approval before acquiring the property. The proposal shall discuss the suitability of the property by comparing it to the selection criteria. As a part of the preparation of the land acquisition proposal, acreage quantification by habitat category will be developed with LACDRP and CDFW based on the following criteria:

Habitat Management Land Selection Criteria: The Applicant must identify the region within which lands shall be acquired, and the type and quality of habitat to be acquired.

Detailed criteria and acreage for each habitat category will be developed with Los Angeles County and CDFW. Foraging habitat shall be assessed as moderate to good with a capacity to improve in quality and value to Swainson's hawks, and must be within the Antelope Valley Swainson's hawk breeding range. Foraging habitat with suitable nest trees is preferred.

Habitat Management Lands Acquisition: Prior to initiating ground-disturbing activities, the Applicant shall provide a proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for off-site mitigation land to be restored, enhanced, or maintained according to the requirements of the biological mitigation measures in this EIR. The proposal will require that mitigation lands identified shall be preserved as open space in perpetuity. Within 45 days of acquiring the mitigation land(s), the Applicant shall record a permanent deed restriction on the mitigation land(s) to be preserved as open space. The deed restriction or conservation easement language shall be submitted to LACDRP and CDFW for review and approval prior to recordation. Alternatively, should a conservation easement on the mitigation land be offered, the permanent conservation easement shall be recorded to the satisfaction of LACDRP and CDFW.

The Applicant shall establish a fund sufficient for the restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation land(s) until such time when the mitigation land(s) become self-sustaining and until such time as the mitigation land(s) meet the requirements of this mitigation measure. The fund shall be established within 90 days of mitigation land(s) acquisition in an amount acceptable to the LACDRP and CDFW.

Land Acquisition Schedule and Financial Assurances: The Applicant shall complete acquisition, or execute an irrevocable option to purchase, of proposed Habitat Management lands and shall provide financial assurances for dedicating adequate funding for impact avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, if necessary, prior to the issuance of building permits. If an irrevocable option to purchase is utilized, the Applicant shall provide a proposed date of purchase which coincides with construction of the facility.

B-6: Prior to alteration of any streambeds, the Applicant shall enter into an agreement with the CDFW, pursuant to Sections 1601 through 1603 of the State Fish and Game Code.

B-7: Within all interior portions of the site within and adjacent to the proposed solar arrays, re-vegetation shall be accomplished (excluding interior roads) as follows:

Vegetation seeded in these areas shall comprise locally-sourced, native species if available, or, native compatible as approved by the County biologist if sufficient locally-sourced native seed stock is not available, approximating low-growing communities such as native perennial or annual grasslands (i.e., wildflower fields). Shrub species shall not be used due to these species inability to survive continued vegetation trimming.

Vegetation shall be maintained in accordance with Los Angeles County Fire Department regulations.

2.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 2 would have a significant effect on Cultural Resources or Paleontological Resources if it would: cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5; cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 2 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Cultural Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

No historical resources were detected within Project 2 during the transect survey conducted for the EIR. Four previously recorded sites were identified during the record search, and were revisited during the transect survey of the proposed Gen-tie Options 1 and 2. Previously recorded site "P19-004250" is within gen-tie Option 1A and 1B, and was recommended as not eligible to the California Register of Historic Resources ("CRHR"). Previously recorded sites "P19-004249", "P19-186876", and "P19-003477" are within gen-tie Options 1B, and were all recommended as not eligible to the CRHR. **(DEIR at 4.5-22)**.

Previously recorded sites P19-004249 and P19-004250 consist of two-track dirt roads, and were recommended not eligible for inclusion on the CRHR because they do not appear to meet the formal definitions of a historical resource or a unique archaeological resources as defined by CEQA. Previously recorded sites P19-004249 P19-004250 are comparatively recent (early to mid-twentieth century), have little potential to yield additional data, and do not meet the requisite criteria, and is therefore recommended as not eligible for listing on the CRHR. Previously recorded site P19-186876 is a transmission line, and was recommended not eligible for inclusion on the CRHR because it does not meet any of the requisite criteria. **(DEIR at 4.5-23)**.

Previously recorded site P19-003477 is an electrical substation, and was recommended not eligible for inclusion on the CRHR because it does not appear to meet the formal definitions of a historical resource or a unique archaeological resources as defined by CEQA. Previously recorded site P19-003477 is comparatively recent (early to mid-twentieth century), has little potential to yield additional data, and does not meet the requisite criteria, and is therefore recommended as not eligible for listing on the CRHR. Therefore, construction of Project 2 will not cause any change in the significance of historical resources. **(DEIR at 4.5-23)**.

There is a moderate possibility that historical and/or archaeological materials would be uncovered during necessary subsurface excavations for the construction of the proposed Project 2, which is a potentially significant impact. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, which describes procedures to be followed in the event that cultural resources are discovered, is required. CUL-1 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-23)**.

No archeological resources were detected during the transect survey. As discussed above, none of the previously recorded sites are considered archaeological resources. Therefore, Project 2 would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. There is a possibility that historical and/or archaeological materials would be uncovered during necessary subsurface excavations for the construction of the proposed Project 2. Although the likelihood of encountering archaeological resources on the site is considered low, this impact is potentially significant. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, which describes procedures to be followed in the event that cultural resources are discovered, is required. CUL-1 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-27).**

Although no paleontological resources were detected during the transect survey of Project 2,the area has potential to contain significant vertebrate fossil remains at relatively shallow depths (10 feet below surface). Based on the paleontological assessment (Dice and Lord 2011), it is unlikely that any intact significant paleontological resources are or will be located on the Project 2 property. Therefore, Project 2 would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources. If Project excavations reach 10 feet or more below current grade and reveal that older Quaternary deposits and/or the later Miocene deposits are exposed, there will be a higher potential for encountering significant vertebrate fossil remains. Deep cuts should be inspected by a qualified paleontologist in an attempt to identify the more sensitive older alluvial strata. **(DEIR at 4.5-30; 31)**.

There is a possibility that paleontological materials would be uncovered if excavations for the construction of the proposed Project 2 reach a depth of 10 feet or more below current grade. Although the likelihood of encountering paleontological resources within the Project 2 area is considered low, this impact is potentially significant. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure PALEO-1, the development of a Paleontological Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Plan ("PRMMP") by a qualified paleontologist is required if construction excavation depth is below 10 feet or more below current grade. PALEO-1 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-31)**. Operation of Project 2 would not require any excavations to the depth of potential paleontological resources. There, operation of Project 2 would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources. **(DEIR at 4.5-31)**.

There is no indication as a result of this study that human remains are present within the boundaries of Project 2. The records search and the field survey indicate no evidence of human remains on or near the sites. Project-related earth disturbance, however, has the potential to

unearth previously undiscovered remains, resulting in a potentially significant impact. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2 that describes procedures to be followed in the event that human remains are discovered would ensure that impacts are reduced to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-32)**.

Project 2 impacts related to Cultural Resources are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

CUL-1: In the event cultural resources are encountered during construction of the Projects, all ground-disturbing activities within the vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall be notified of the find. The archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to recordation and excavation of the finds and evaluation and processing of the finds in accordance with § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of, but are not limited to, stone, bone, fossils, wood or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites.

If the resources are determined to be unique historic resources as defined under § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, Mitigation Measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate Mitigation Measures for significant resources could include but not be limited to avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds.

No further earthwork shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any archaeological artifacts recovered because of mitigation will be donated to a qualified scientific institution approved by the Lead Agency where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.

CUL-2: In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, California State Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 dictates that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to CEQA regulations and PRC § 5097.98. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.

PALEO-1: A qualified paleontologist shall be retained by the Applicant prior to excavations reaching 10 feet in depth or greater. The paleontologist shall develop and execute a PRMMP and supervise a paleontological monitor whom shall monitor all ground-disturbing activities associated with such excavations. The Program will outline the procedures to follow in regards to paleontological resources (e.g. monitoring protocols, curation, data recovery of fossils, reporting). If fossils are

found during such excavation, the paleontological monitor shall be authorized to halt ground-disturbing activities within 25 feet of the find to allow evaluation of the find and determination of appropriate treatment according to the Program.

2.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Potential Effect:

Project 2 would have a significant effect on Geology and Soils if it would: expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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 active fault trace; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides; result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; 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; be located on expansive soil; have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater; or conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance or hillside design standards in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element.

Finding:

Project 2 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Geology and Soils. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 2 and the Project 2 gen-tie line are not located in an active or potentially active fault zone according to the California Geological Survey ("CGS") Seismic Hazard Zone Maps (CGS 2008) and Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map (CGS 2010). The closest fault zones are the San Andreas Fault Zone, which is located approximately 2 miles to the south southwest of the Project 2 site, and the Garlock Fault Zone, which is located approximately 23 miles northwest of the Project 2 site. Based on research and available information, Project 2 is susceptible to seismicity, but is not susceptible to fault rupture; therefore, impacts involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-13)**.

The United States Geological Survey ("USGS") National Seismic Hazard Map (2008) indicates that Project 2 and the Project 2 gen-tie line are located in an area mapped from 60 to 80 percent gravity for peak horizontal acceleration with a 10 percent probability of exceedance in the next 50 years. According to the USGS, and dependent on structural design, 10 percent gravity is the

lower threshold at which damages to structures are likely to occur. Based on geologic and soil conditions at the site, the USGS Ground Motion Parameter Calculator indicates that Project 2 facilities will need to be designed to sustain spectral accelerations of approximately 0.782 to 1.812 percent gravity (USGS 2012). **(DEIR at 4.6-16)**.

Project 2 has the potential to be subjected to ground motion during construction. However, because of the temporary nature of the construction period relative to the frequency of occurrence of significant seismic events, the potential for Project 2 construction to expose people or structures to substantially adverse effects due to seismicity and ground motion will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-16)**. During operation of the facility, all Project 2 structures and operational facilities will be designed in accordance with the California Building Code ("CBC") and applicable industry standards. The design and construction of Project 2 would comply with all applicable building codes and standards established by regulatory agencies, including the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the CBC. Therefore, Project 2 impacts related to seismic shaking and strong ground motion hazards would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-15)**.

The CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) does not identify Project 2 or the Project 2 gen-tie line as being located in zones with the potential for liquefaction or ground failure. Additionally, Project 2 is located on poorly sorted coarse grained materials with groundwater typically greater than 100 feet below ground surface (bgs) (USGS 2008). Based on available geologic information, the potential susceptibility of ground failure is less than significant for Project 2 construction and operation. **(DEIR at 4.6-19)**.

The location of Project 2 and its associated gen-tie lines contains includes sloped sections; however, Project 2 development will be constrained to areas consisting of less than 20 percent gradients, with the majority of development occurring in areas with slopes ranging from flat to 5 percent. As indicated in the Project description, development of the solar facility would not result in significant changes to existing site grades, and would not increase the susceptibility to slope failure. Additionally, the CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) does not identify Project 2 as being located in zones susceptible to landslides or slope failure. Therefore, the potential susceptibility for slope failure and landslides during construction and operation is less than significant for Project 2. **(DEIR at 4.6-20)**.

The soil series at the location of Project 2 and the Project 2 gen-tie line include Greenfield sandy loam, Hanford coarse sandy loam, Hesperia fine sandy loam, Ramona coarse sandy loam, and terrace escarpments. These soil series have an erosion factor of 0.15 to 0.28, indicating a low to medium susceptibility to water erosion, and a wind erodibility group of 3, indicating a low to medium susceptibility to wind erosion. Implementation of appropriate erosion and sediment control BMPs will be implemented during construction and operation of Project 2, as outlined in Draft EIR Hydrology Section 4.9 and Air Quality Section 4.3, and will mitigate potential impacts to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.6-21)**.

Based on the information in the Geotechnical Critical Issues Analyses and Custom Soil Resource Reports prepared by Tetra Tech, the location of Project 2 and the Project 2 gen-tie line contains mostly low gradient slopes and rolling hills. Development of solar facilities will not result in

significant changes to existing site grades, and will not increase the susceptibility to slope failure. Additionally, the CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) indicates that Project 2 is not susceptible to landslide or liquefaction hazards.

Although subsidence has occurred throughout the Antelope Valley, the majority of subsidence has been concentrated near the City of Lancaster and was caused by excessive groundwater pumping and decreased water levels. Subsidence did not occur in the vicinity of Project 2 from 1930 to 1992, and there has been no surficial evidence such as fissures and differential settling near the Project 2 location. Based on historic rates of subsidence and a relatively stabilizing water level due to reduced pumping and proposed aquifer management, future subsidence is expected to negligible in the vicinity of Project 2. Based on geologic data and the proposed construction and operation as described in the Project description, Project 2 impacts to on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-23)**.

The soil series at the location of Project 2 and the Project 2 gen-tie line include Greenfield sandy loam, Hanford coarse sandy loam, Hesperia fine sandy loam, Ramona coarse sandy loam, and terrace escarpments. These soil series are rated for a low shrink/swell potential, and the potential for expansive soils to affect Project 2 is less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-25)**.

Project 2 does not propose the use of any sanitary facilities that will require septic tanks or sanitary wastewater disposal during either construction or operation. Therefore, no impact will occur. Project 2 is not in the hillside area, and is not affected by Hillside Management Areas. **(DEIR at 4.6-26)**.

2.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Potential Effect:

Project 2 would have a significant impact related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change if it would: generate direct or indirect GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment, based on any applicable threshold of significance; or conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 2 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 2's short-term GHG emissions during the construction phase (maximum daily emissions of 5,423 pounds per day) would not exceed the AVAQMD significance threshold for maximum daily emissions (548,000 pounds per day). As such, Project 2 would not exceed thresholds or

result in violating GHG standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected GHG violation. **(DEIR at 4.7-21)**.

Because construction of the six Project sites may overlap, concurrent construction emissions of Projects 1-6 were analyzed by emissions per year and thus compared to the annual GHG threshold of 100,000 metric tons of CO_{2e} per year, for long-term emissions. The unmitigated peak annual construction levels for all six Project sites are expected to result in annual GHG emissions below the most stringent annual threshold proposed by the AVAQMD (100,000 tons per year). As such, the Project will not exceed thresholds or result in violating GHG standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected GHG violation. **(DEIR at 4.7-23)**.

During operations, Project 2 facility operation would be limited to general maintenance, panel washing, and security. The primary source of emissions during operations is mainly the vehicles used by facility maintenance staff to and from the site. It is anticipated that operations and maintenance would utilize one water truck for panel washing and one light duty truck twice per year. Although Project 2 is scheduled for bi-annual panel washing, a maximum of ten trips were assumed for each Project (four round trips plus one additional round trip to be conservative). The operation emissions provided for each Project are considered the Project's baseline emissions, since it does not include any solar energy reductions. Because operations-related GHG emissions are considered long term, the AVAQMD daily significance threshold of 100,000 metric tons of CO_{2e} per year was used to analyze impacts during operations. The total annual operational emissions for Project 2 are 5.01 tons of CO_{2e} per year, which is well below the AVAQMD threshold of 100,000 tons per year. **(DEIR at 4.7-25)**. Likewise, concurrent operation of all six Projects is estimated to generate approximately 31 metric tons of CO_{2e} annually, which is well below the AVAQMD threshold. **(DEIR at 4.7-27)**.

Construction-related emissions from Project 2 would be temporary and finite in nature, below the applicable thresholds, and are consistent with the AB 32 Scoping Plan. Accordingly, Project 2's construction-related GHG emissions would not be a cumulatively considerable contribution to climate change. Project 2's operational GHG emissions would be negligible and not comprise a cumulatively considerable contribution to climate change and, therefore, would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.7-28).**

Furthermore, with implementation of Project 2, there would be an added environmental benefit of displacing GHG emissions in the region. The solar energy generation would offset emissions from electricity usage, which would otherwise be produced by fossil-fueled power generation facilities using petroleum, natural gas, or coal combustion. Project 2 would result in a temporary increase in GHG emissions which is below the most stringent proposed threshold; employ active solar technologies supportive of the state's goals to reduce GHG emissions; and is consistent with the County of Los Angeles's goals. **(DEIR at 4.7-29)**.

Project 2 would therefore be in accordance with the state's need for the construction of renewable energy power plants to meet the state's GHG reduction objectives including:

- California's RPS that requires California's investor-owned electric utilities to obtain 20 percent of the electricity that they supply by 2010 from renewable sources;

- Executive Order S-14-08, which established the RPS targets for California that "all retail sellers of electricity shall serve 33 percent of their load with renewable energy by 2020";

- Executive Order S-03-05 on climate change to advance renewable energy and other solutions to reduce California's GHG emissions; and

- The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) that established a comprehensive program of regulatory and market mechanisms to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020.

Project 2 includes various project design features and objectives that address global climate change and reduce GHG emissions, as do each of the Projects 1-6. Project design features include aspects of the Project that either must be incorporated as part of the conditions of approval, or that the Applicant has committed to include to reduce GHG impacts associated with the Project. The Projects would be designed to reduce emissions through specific goals set. The expected Project features would directly or indirectly result in lower emissions of GHGs. The Project design features that address global climate change impacts include the following:

- Vegetation to sequester GHGs
    - Preserve natural areas by mowing, which maintains the organic material in the soil
    - Preserve open space by limiting constructing on portions of Project site
    - Plant trees and shrubs along the edges as buffers to adjacent receptors

- Construction limitations to minimize GHG emissions
    - Limit construction equipment idling beyond regulation requirements
    - Limit number of simultaneous construction projects by phasing

As such, Project 2 would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation to reduce GHG emissions. **(DEIR at 4.7-30)**. In addition to the Project design features listed above, the Project's impacts related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

GHG-1 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.

GHG-2 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not idle more than five minutes in any one hour.

GHG-3 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operations of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.

GHG-4 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.

GHG-5 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.

2.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Potential Effect:

Project 2 would have a significant effect on Hazards and Hazardous Materials if it would: create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment; emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses; be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; for a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires, due to location within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4); expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, due to location within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires due to location within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires due to location within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard; or constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 2 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 2 would not require extensive or ongoing use of hazardous materials. Hazardous materials used during the construction of Project 2 would be typical of most construction projects of this type. Hazardous materials used during construction activities may include gasoline, diesel fuel, oils, lubricants, solvents, detergents, degreasers, paints, and other supplies. All hazardous materials would be transported, stored, and properly disposed of in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. The accidental release of hazardous materials or wastes during construction activities is possible. The accidental release of hazardous materials or wastes would be promptly contained and abated in accordance with all applicable laws and regulatory requirements, and therefore is not expected to result in a significant impact. **(DEIR at 4.8-11)**. During operation of Project 2, limited quantities of hazardous materials would be stored on-site. These materials would include fire suppressant and transformer insulating oil (mineral oil). The mineral oil would be contained within Project 2 electrical transformers and switches. Project 2 would develop and implement a hazardous materials and hazardous waste management program for both construction and operational phases. The program would include the following, as required by applicable regulations. **(DEIR at 4.8-11)**.

- **Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste Handling:** The construction contractor would prepare a Project-specific hazardous materials management and hazardous waste management program for Project 2. This program would be implemented prior to the start of construction activities. The program would prescribe proper hazardous material use, storage, and disposal requirements, as well as hazardous waste management procedures. The program would identify specific types of hazardous materials to be used during Project 2 construction and operation, and specific types of wastes that will be generated. All personnel would be provided with Project-specific training. These programs would be developed to ensure that all hazardous materials and hazardous wastes would be handled and disposed of in a safe and environmentally sound manner consistent with all applicable laws and regulations. Employees and contractor personnel handling wastes would receive hazardous materials training and be trained in hazardous waste procedures, spill contingencies, waste minimization procedures and treatment, storage, and disposal facility ("TSDF") training in accordance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration ("OSHA") Hazard Communication Standard and 22 CCR. Prior to the start of construction of Project 2, a Hazardous Materials Business Plan ("HMBP") will be prepared and submitted in accordance with Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code and Title 22 CCR, as required by the Certified Unified Program Agency.

- **Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan:** The construction contractor would prepare a site-specific SWPPP for review and approval by the appropriate regulatory agencies and implement it prior to the start of demolition or construction activities at Project 2. The SWPPP would utilize BMPs to address the storage and handling of hazardous materials and sediment runoff during demolition and construction activities.

- **Transport of Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Wastes:** Hazardous materials transported by truck would include fuel (diesel fuel and gasoline) and oils and lubricants

for equipment. Transportation of hazardous waste may include hazardous building materials and small amounts of construction waste such as waste oils, solvents, or cleaners. The construction contractor would prepare written procedures for the transport of hazardous materials and hazardous waste in accordance with the California Vehicle Code, California Highway Patrol Regulations (CCR Title 13); Department of Transportation Regulations, Title 49, CFR; and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regulations, Title 40 CFR, and CCR 22 regulations prior to the start of construction activities at Project 2.

- **Fueling and Maintenance of Construction Equipment:** The construction contractor would prepare written procedures for the fueling and maintenance of construction equipment prior to the start of construction activities at Project 2. Vehicles and equipment would be refueled off-site or on-site by refueling trucks. If on-site refueling or maintenance activities are required, refueling and maintenance procedures would include implementation of BMPs to ensure that chemicals do not come in contact with the ground. Equipment will be inspected daily for potential leakage or failures.

- **Emergency Release Response Procedures:** The construction contractor would prepare an Emergency Release Response Plan ("ERRP") detailing the response to releases of hazardous materials. The ERRP would be prepared prior to the start of construction activities at Project 2. The ERRP would prescribe hazardous materials handling procedures for reducing the potential for a release during construction activities, and would include an emergency response program to ensure the rapid and safe cleanup of any accidental spills. All hazardous material spills of threatened release would be immediately reported. All construction and operations personnel would be aware of federal, state, and local emergency response reporting guidelines. Implementation of the aforementioned hazardous materials and hazardous waste management programs would reduce the potential impacts associated with the handling, transport, and use of hazardous materials during both construction and operation of Project 2 to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.8-12)**.

If lead based paint is found during construction of Project 2, the Applicant would comply with County requirements and provide a copy of the qualifications/license of the lead based paint abatement contractor that will perform the abatement or removal of lead based paint to the Department of Public Works Building and Safety Division and the County of Los Angeles Fire Department Health and Hazardous Materials Division. If required by the County, the Applicant would prepare and submit a Hazardous Building Materials Demolition Assessment and Management Plan to the Department of Public Works and Fire Department for review and approval to ensure compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local laws, and regulations. OSHA regulations are in place to assure that these materials are safely removed prior to or during demolition and renovation activities. In compliance with regulations requiring removals by firms and individuals licensed to do such work pursuant to applicable regulations the Project's potential impacts regarding lead exposure would be less than significant. Implementation of the aforementioned ERRP would reduce the potential impacts associated with upset and accidental release conditions at Project 2 (and gen-tie lines) to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.8-13)**.

Project 2 would convert sunlight directly into electrical energy without the creation of hazardous emissions, and no impact to sensitive land uses would occur as a result of hazardous emissions. The primary emissions created by Project 2 (and gen-tie lines) would be air emissions from vehicle and equipment exhaust generated during construction activities. Potential impacts due to air emissions created during construction and maintenance activities at Project 2 would be less than significant, as discussed in Section 4.3 of the DEIR. **(DEIR at 4.8-13)**.

Based on the Environmental Data Review ("EDR"), the location of Project 2 and the Project 2 gen-tie line is not located at a known site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites complied pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No Recognized Environmental Conditions ("RECs") were indicated to be located in the vicinity of Project 2, and no known releases have occurred at or adjacent to the Project 2 site. Based on the information compiled in the EDR, Project 2 would have no impact due to site hazards to the public and environment during construction or operations. **(DEIR at 4.8-14)**.

Project 2 and gen-tie lines are not located within an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, Project 2 would have no impact on public use airports. **(DEIR at 4.8-15; 16)**.

Emergency response and evacuation procedures for Project 2 would be coordinated by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department ("LACSD") and the Los Angeles County Fire Department ("LACFD"). During Project 2 construction activities, the LACSD and LACFD require that adequate vehicular access be provided and maintained. The Traffic Control Plan for Project 2 would provide for the required access of emergency vehicles during construction activities. During operation of Project 2, Project operation staff would work with both the LACSD and the LACFD to ensure adequate emergency procedures are in place. The HMBP would include an Emergency Response Plan. Additionally, an Emergency Action Plan and a Fire Prevention Plan would be prepared for Project 2 as required by Cal/OSHA. These plans would ensure that Project 2 would have established plans and procedures for responding to emergency situations, and would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, Project 2 impacts to emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans would be less than significant during both construction and operations. **(DEIR at 4.8-17)**.

Project 2 is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. No impact would occur in this regard. **(DEIR at 4.8-17)**. A public water system for fire control does not exist near Project 2. The facility design includes a dedicated 10,000-gallon fire water storage tank to be installed and maintained at Project 2, in compliance with LACFD Regulation 19 and other applicable Fire Department water tank specifications. Because the SGF design includes a dedicated fire water tank meeting Fire Department requirements, the water and pressure would meet fire flow needs. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.8-18)**.

Project 2 is surrounded by rural agricultural lands with no industrial uses, manufacturing uses, or other particularly high fire hazard uses in the vicinity. Project 2 would comply with all applicable Fire Code and County and City ordinance requirements, and fire safety standards, as stated in DEIR Section 4.12 Public Safety. A Fire Management Plan, which would be prepared for Project

2, establishes standards and practices that would minimize the risk of fire and, in the event of fire, provide for immediate suppression and notification. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(DEIR at 4.8-18)**.

Project 2 will convert sunlight into electrical energy through a process which would not constitute a fire hazard. All materials and equipment used in the construction of each facility would be specified based on applicable codes and building regulations. Welding activities may also potentially result in the combustion of brush and vegetation. A Fire Protection and Prevention Plan would reduce these potential impacts to less than significant. A Fire Prevention Plan would be prepared for Project 2 as required by Cal/OSHA, and Project 2 would include a dedicated 10,000- gallon fire water storage tank in compliance with LACFD Regulation 19. Therefore, Project 2 does not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard, and would have a less than significant impact on fire hazards in the area. **(DEIR at 4.8-19)**.

Project 2 impacts related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

HH-1 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Materials Management and Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.

HH-2 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.

HH-5 Construction activities shall be halted if previously unidentified soil contamination is observed or indicated by testing during any earthwork activities. Construction will be halted or redirected until such soil contamination is evaluated and disposed of and/or treated.

2.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Project 2 would have a potentially significant impact on Hydrology and Water Quality if it would: violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; 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; substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; 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; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; generate construction or

post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality; conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52); result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance; use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course); otherwise substantially degrade water quality; 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, or within a floodway or floodplain; place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain; 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; or place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 2 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

A Notice of Intent form would be submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board ("SWRCB") to apply for coverage under the NPDES General Permit for construction of Project 2. During construction, Project 2 would implement BMPs as specified in the site-specific SWPPP. The SWPPP would be developed by a State of California certified Qualified SWPPP Developer ("QSD") and during construction monitored by a State of California certified Qualified SWPPP Practitioner ("QSP"). The SWPPP would be approved by the County and uploaded to the State via the State SMARTs system prior to Project 2 ground-breaking. The SWPPP would identify construction-phase BMPs to be implemented. With implementation of the BMPs, Project 2 and its associated gen-tie lines would only have the potential to generate less than significant effects on groundwater and/or stormwater runoff, and will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during construction. **(DEIR at 4.9-34; 4.9-38)**.

During Project 2 operations, mechanical equipment on the solar farm would either be made of pollutant free materials or fitted with special containment units to house any possible drips or spills of lubricants, oils, or other chemicals. Maintenance activities, including solar array washing, would be performed with clean water and allowed to evaporate or drip to the ground. Maintenance and operations personnel would be required to maintain all necessary spill prevention, control, and countermeasures on hand during site visits. These spill response kits would include, but are not limited to, personal protective equipment, spill pads, absorbents, booms, shovels, garbage bags, plastic sheeting, and disposal drums. Permanent treatment BMPs would include infiltration basins to preserve water quality. With these spill prevention, control, and countermeasures on-site, there would be a less than significant impact on groundwater and stormwater runoff quality, and Project 2 will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during operation. **(DEIR at 4.9-34; 4.9-38).**

As stated in Section 4.14.5 of the DEIR, water would be required for dust control measures during the duration of construction efforts. An analysis of the water supply, including the use of well water, is presented in DEIR Section 4.14 Utilities and Service Systems. At the outset of construction, water would be supplied via truck to meet the demands of Project 2. Well water is not considered available at this time, and would be reevaluated upon a change in status. The demands of Project 2 are anticipated to have a less than significant impact on the region's groundwater supplies. Furthermore, construction activities are not anticipated to interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. As stated in Section 4.14.5 of the DEIR, water may be required in the first few years of operation to establish the mature vegetation planted after construction. Similar to the construction period, water would be supplied via truck to Project 2. The volume of water required would be considerably less than the water required for construction activities. Well water would be considered if its availability changes. As with construction, impacts to the region's groundwater supplies are anticipated to be less than significant with operation of Project 2. Also, the effect on groundwater recharge by the development's increase in impervious surface will be mitigated by the proposed infiltration basins. These infiltration basins will allow the increase in runoff volume from the proposed development (up to the 25-year storm event) to infiltrate on-site and recharge the groundwater basin. Therefore, less than significant impacts to groundwater recharge are anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-35)**.

During construction of Project 2 and its associated gen-tie lines, soils would be disturbed through activities such as minor grading and vegetation removal, which could lead to issues with soil erosion and siltation on- and off-site. Through the implementation of construction control measures per California Association of Stormwater Quality Agencies ("CASQA") standards (silt fencing, fiber rolls, and sandbag barriers), Project 2 would have less than significant impacts on erosion and debris deposition during construction (CASQA 2003). Project 2 and its associated gen-tie lines would require minor grading on-site which would not drastically change the existing drainage patterns or natural channels. Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan ("SUSMP")/Low Impact Development ("LID") Reports would help account for the increase in runoff erosion capabilities resulting from the developments' increase in impervious surfaces. The infiltration basins would help reduce flow velocities and the sediment load of the runoff, which would lower the erosion and siltation capabilities of the runoff. Therefore, Project 2 would result in less than significant impacts to erosion and siltation on- and off-site. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Project 2 and its associated gen-tie lines would require minor grading on-site, which would not drastically change the existing drainage patterns or natural channels. The increase in runoff flow rates and volumes from the developments' increase in impervious surfaces would be addressed by Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7. The infiltration basins, created by elevated road sections, would capture the increase in runoff volume (up to the 25-year storm event) and allow it to infiltrate on-site. The remaining runoff would flow over the road section and return to pre-development flow conditions before leaving the project site. With this measure, less than significant impacts would occur related to flooding on- and off-site. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7 would address the increase in runoff flow rates and volumes from

the developments' increase in impervious surfaces. The infiltration basins, created by elevated road sections, would capture the increase in runoff volume (up to the 25-year storm event) and allow it to infiltrate on-site. The remaining runoff would flow over the road section and return to predevelopment flow conditions before leaving the Project site. The basins would be placed within the first half of the site to allow flows over the roads sections enough time to normalize before leaving Project 2. Project soils would treat the captured runoff at the infiltration basins. Therefore, less than significant impacts to existing or planned stormwater drainage systems are anticipated. Also, significant impacts to polluted runoff are not anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Project 2 and its associated gen-tie lines would incorporate Los Angeles County LID standards, while following the requirements of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works ("LACDPW"). Existing on-site drainage patterns and channels would not be significantly altered by the Projects' minimal grading, and all off-site drainage patterns and channels would not be significantly impacted either. Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7 would allow the developments' increase in runoff (up to the 25-year storm event) to be both infiltrated and treated on-site. This also minimizes downstream impacts by returning to predevelopment flow conditions. Therefore, Project 2 will not conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance. **(DEIR at 4.9-38)**.

Project 2 and its associated gen-tie lines are not in the vicinity of any SWRCB-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated. During construction, wastewater treatment systems would not be necessary. The Projects would contract services to supply and maintain portable toilets. Therefore, the impacts of Project 2 to the quality of groundwater and surface water would be less than significant during construction. The same portable toilet services would be contracted for operations. Temporary portable toilet services would be delivered during the required maintenance periods on an as needed basis. As a result, there would be less than significant impacts to the water quality of groundwater and surface water during Project 2 operations. **(DEIR at 4.9-39)**.

Project 2 does not involve the construction of housing. Therefore, no housing will be placed within a 100-year flood hazard area, and no impacts are anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-39)**.

Project 2 is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain, or within the immediate vicinity of any levees or dams which would place people or structures at risk of significant loss, injury or death in the event of a failure. In the event of a failure of the aqueduct near Project 2, the distance between the site and the aqueduct would allow the flow to dissipate. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated. Project 2 has slopes that are less than 5 percent. Additionally, Project 2 and its gen-tie line are not within the vicinity of any significantly steep slopes which could generate high mudflow conditions. Accordingly, Project 2 will not place structures in an area subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow. **(DEIR at 4.9-40)**.

Project 2 impacts related to Hydrology and Water Quality are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

HYDRO-1 Education and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants and Employees. Appropriate educational materials and training for preventing stormwater pollution and additional BMP Fact Sheets from the California Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks can be found at www.cabmphandbooks.com. Practical information material will be provided to employees on general good housekeeping practices. These materials will describe, but are not limited to, spill prevention and control and the use of chemicals, petroleum products, pesticides and fertilizers that should be limited to the property, with no discharge of wastes directly or indirectly to gutters, catch basins or the storm drain system. Information will be distributed directly to the employees as well as being posted in public areas. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities. The required materials shall be available at each project site and a log kept to show education has occurred prior to the start of construction.

HYDRO-2 A spill contingency plan will be prepared by the owner/building operator. As a minimum the Spill Contingency Plan will "mandate the stockpiling of cleanup materials, notification of responsible agencies, disposal of cleanup materials and documentation." This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-3 No hazardous materials are anticipated to be stored on-site. If hazardous materials are required to be stored on-site, a designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in accordance with requirements of the Health & Safety Code and store the materials according to applicable regulations. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-4 A designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in compliance with the current requirements of the County of Los Angeles Fire Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-5 Site waste receptacles shall be emptied on a weekly basis or more often to prevent containers from overflowing. Upon inspection any debris or rubbish will be picked up and the site cleaned. The trash area is NOT to be cleaned by hosing down. The type of materials used to clean the area and storage of said materials will be determined by the Contractor. Signage will be posted that lids shall be kept closed at all times. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 at all times during facility operations.

2.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Potential Effect:

Project 2 would have a significant effect related to Land Use and Planning if it would: physically divide an established community; be inconsistent with applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to, the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans; be inconsistent with the zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject properties; or conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria.

Finding:

Project 2 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Land Use and Planning. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 2 is located within a sparsely populated area, and is not located within any established community. Project 2 is located in an area that has been characterized by agricultural uses for several decades, and has been in transition to residential uses or vacant land. Project 2 would not physically alter the community, would not divide any community, or change any public access routes to them. Impacts would be considered to be less than significant. Likewise, Project 2's proposed gen-tie lines would not result in physical improvements that would result in dividing an established community, and the proposed gen-tie line would be located within a public right-of-way or an easement on private land. Therefore, Project 2 would not divide an established community, and impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.10-36)**.

Project 2 is not located within the boundaries of a Community Standards District; therefore, no district development standards apply to Project 2. The Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan designates the Project 2 site as N-1, Non-Urban use. According to the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, allowable uses in the N-1 designation include utility installations (County of Los Angeles 1986). Project 2 is considered a utility installation, and therefore would be consistent with the N-1 land use designation. As a result, Project 2 would be consistent with the General Plan Land Use designation. Development of Project 2 will be consistent with permissible uses associated with the land use designation and the policies, goals, and objectives outlined in the Los Angeles County General Plan and the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, and will not be inconsistent with any applicable County plan. **(DEIR at 4.10-36)**.

The gen-tie lines for Project 2 are linear infrastructure that would not result in any changes to the existing land use patterns in the area of Project 2. The gen-tie lines would be located underground within Los Angeles County to the extent practicable, and aboveground within the City of Lancaster, either in a public road ROW or on private lands adjacent to the public road ROW. Within the City of Lancaster, the gen-tie line routes would traverse land use designations "NU" Residential and "UR" in the City of Lancaster. According to the County's Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, allowable uses in the N-1 designation include utility installations.

Additionally, the City's NU land use designation permits solar generating facilities and utility installations within its designation. In July 2013, the City approved a General Plan Amendment for the UR designation to NU designation for another applicant's solar project that the gen-tie line would traverse to connect to the Antelope Substation. A franchise agreement will be obtained by the Applicant with the City of Lancaster for the gen-tie line that will traverse through this jurisdiction. This agreement will grant a utility franchise and right of way privileges for the proposed gen-tie line. Therefore, no impact to County and City Plans would occur**.** Project 2 would not be located within the Fox Airfield's airport influence area. Therefore, this Plan is not applicable to Project 2, and there would be no impacts. **(DEIR at 4.10-37)**.

The County's CUP entitlement process involves the discretionary review of a project, whereby conditions of approval for Project 2 would be assigned. A CUP Burden of Proof is required to be submitted to determine Project 2's consistency with the General Plan, compatibility with surrounding land uses, conditions to ensure compatibility, land suitability and physical constraints, project design, availability of adequate access, public services and facilities to serve the development, and identify potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures. As shown in DEIR Tables 4.10-1, 4.10-2, and 4.10-3, Project 2 is consistent with County land use designations and compatible with adjacent and surrounding land uses. **(DEIR at 4.10-43)**. The implementation of the environmental mitigation measures and CUP conditions would be expected to minimize Project 2's potential impacts, such that the Project could occur while maintaining zoning compliance within the designated zone. As a result, Project 2 would be consistent with the County's zoning designations. Permitting processes for those portions of the gen-tie lines located in the City of Lancaster would require necessary approvals from the City. Compliance with applicable City zoning regulations and conditions would ensure consistency with City's zoning designations. **(DEIR at 4.10-38)**.

Project 2 and lands adjacent to its associated gen-tie line ROW are located within the County's Heavy Agriculture (A-2) Zone. Project 2 is considered equivalent to an electric generating plant. Under the County zoning code for the A-2 zoning designation (Los Angeles County Code Section 22.24.150), electric generating plants and transmission substations are allowed in the A-2 zones with the issuance of a CUP. Lands adjacent to the gen-tie line for Project 2 would consist of the City's RR 2.5 Zone. The proposed gen-tie lines would be constructed underground within Los Angeles County unless other applicable regulations require above-ground installation and aboveground or underground within the City of Lancaster. The gen-tie lines would be located on private lands adjacent to the public road ROW or within the public road ROW. They are linear facilities that would not result in any changes to the existing land use patterns in the Project 2 area, and would be permitted as part of respective County CUP and City permitting requirements. **(DEIR at 4.10-38)**. As a result, implementation of Project 2 and its associated gen-tie lines would be expected to be consistent with County and City zoning designations, and would result in a less than significant impact relative to the A-2 zoning in Los Angeles County and the RR 2.5 zoning in the City of Lancaster.

As discussed in DEIR Section 4.4 Biological Resources, Project 2 and its associated gen-tie lines are not located within a designated SEA; therefore, SEA conformance criteria do not apply. **(DEIR at 4.10-39)**. Project 2 is located near the foothills, and the site has slightly greater slopes than the other Projects 1-6. Portions of Project 2 are located within the Hillside Management Area; however, this Project would not conflict with the Hillside Management criteria since

construction of the solar facility and gen-tie line would be constrained to areas consisting of less than 20 percent slope. Development of the solar facility will not result in significant changes to existing site grades, and would not increase the susceptibility to slope failure. Additionally, the CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map does not identify Project 2 as being proposed in zones of required investigation for earthquake-induced landslide potential. Additionally, the gen-tie line for Project 2 would not be located within a Hillside Management Area. Therefore, there is no impact from the risk for landslides or slope failure. **(DEIR at 4.10-40)**.

Project 2 is located within an Agricultural Opportunity Area, as discussed in Section 4.2 of the DEIR. Project 2 would generate electrical power through renewable solar PV technology which is an allowable use with a CUP and where necessary, a zone change. Project 2 would involve conversion of land that was formerly used for agricultural production to renewable energy production. Construction and operation of Project 2 would not involve other restrictions, obstructions, or resources that could result in conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use. Additionally, Project 2 would be located on fallow land that is currently not irrigated, with surrounding parcels being mostly undeveloped and fallow agricultural land. Project 2 would produce power in a passive manner and would result in minimal air emissions, traffic, and noise, and would not affect adjacent agricultural operations. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(DEIR at 4.10-40)**.

Project 2 contains no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as discussed in DEIR Section 4.2 Agriculture and Forestry. Therefore, Project 2 will have no impact to Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. **(DEIR at 4.10-40)**. Project 2 is not located within a Noise Management Area. **(DEIR at 4.10-41)**.

Project 2 and its associated gen-tie lines are located within the 500-year floodplain Zone X (Unshaded). These areas are known to be of a very low flood risk. All of the Project 2 area would be developed, and measures would be taken in the design of the site's solar panels to account for the flood hazards. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(DEIR at 4.10-41)**.

2.11 NOISE

Potential Effect:

Project 2 would have a significant Noise impact if it would: result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the project; result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; for a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels; or, for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 2 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Noise.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Construction at Project 2 would take place between the first and third quarters of 2014. Sound generated from Project 2 would consist of: (1) short duration sounds resulting from construction activities, and (2) sound during normal facility operations. Vibration from Project 2 would only result during construction. Construction activities would take place only during daytime hours. An evaluation of expected noise and vibration levels was performed, and the ability of Project 2 to comply with applicable noise requirements was assessed.

The Draft EIR determined that the construction noise for Project 2 would be similar to that of Project 1; therefore, the Draft EIR's discussion of Project 2's noise impacts focused on the differences between Project 1 and Project 2, namely received sound levels at the nearest noise sensitive receptor. **(DEIR at 4.11-30)**. These Findings refer to certain facts from the Draft EIR's discussion of Project 1 noise impacts that are also applicable to Project 2.

For Project 2, the following criteria were determined to be inapplicable or to result in no impact:

- Exposure of on-site workers to noise levels that exceed occupational safety standards (90 dBA as a time-weighted 8-hour average or peak noise levels above 115 dBA).

- Exposure of residents to airport or private airstrip-related noise levels above a CNEL of 65 dBA.

Occupational noise exposure is governed by federal and state regulations. Cal/OSHA administers industrial safety regulations in California. Cal/OSHA regulations establish a time-weighted noise exposure limit of 90 dBA averaged over 8 hours (CCR, Title 8, Article 105). Noise source controls, administrative procedures, or worker hearing protection must be provided if worker noise exposure would exceed the 90 dBA limit. The construction contractor selected for the Project would be required to follow Cal/OSHA requirements for construction worker noise exposure. **(DEIR at 4.11-25; 4.11-30)**.

Sound from construction equipment would vary dependent on the construction phase and the number and class of equipment at a location at any given time. Actual received sound levels would fluctuate, depending on the construction activity, equipment type, and separation distances between source and receiver. **(DEIR at 4.11-30)**. Construction noise is a temporary noise source that would only occur during daytime hours. Sound levels from construction are expected to be comparable to sound produced by farm machinery, such as equipment used in nearby agricultural fields. Worst case construction noise levels for the nearest residence would last no more than a few weeks, as construction activities progress across Project 2. Therefore, no one residence would be exposed to significant noise levels for any extended period of time. **(DEIR at 4.11-27)**.

Sound from pile driving would attenuate to 83 dBA at the nearest residence to Project 2, and would attenuate to below 60 dBA within 1 linear mile of this construction activity, depending on meteorological and topographical effects. The average noise level from pile driving is predicted to be 66 dBA, similar to the level resulting at the Project centroid located 1,545 feet from the nearest residence. Because sound levels would be higher than 60 dBA at times, and up to 83 dBA at the closest residence, an exceedance of the County's construction noise level limits is anticipated. Therefore, where pile driving is planned to occur within 3,000 feet of an occupied noise sensitive receptor, an acoustic curtain or sound barrier with a sound transmission class of 19 or greater will be used to reduce received sound levels at the noise sensitive receptors to levels at or below the County's construction noise limit of 60 dBA. Pile driving is expected to last more than 10 days, and a variance from the County of Los Angeles noise ordinance will be required.

Traffic noise generated during construction of Project 2 on and offsite would temporarily add to overall sound levels. As a general construction practice, functional mufflers would be maintained on all equipment to maintain noise levels as low as reasonably achievable. The Project 2 Applicant would make reasonable efforts to minimize noise resulting from construction activities, as described in Mitigation Measures N1 - N6. In sum, with mitigation measures implemented, including the use of sound curtains or barriers during pile driving, construction sound levels would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.11-27; 4.11-31)**.

Like noise from pile driving, vibration from pile driving would only last for a few weeks at most, and would move throughout the Project rapidly with no single noise sensitive receptor experiencing the peak 0.09 PPV for more than an few hours, which will be perceptible but will not damage structures. Therefore, exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels due to the construction of Project 2 and the gen-tie line will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.11-48)**.

Once operational, Project 2 would generate power using PV modules mounted in rows of parallel racks. The Project is anticipated to be unmanned during normal operation. Systems monitoring would be completed remotely and onsite staff would be limited to repair or cleaning of the PV modules. Maintenance staff would visit two times per year to clean the PV modules, seasonally to clear vegetation, and as needed to perform other general maintenance activities. **(DEIR at 4.11-31)**. Sound sources considered in the operational acoustic analysis include the inverters and transformers associated with the PV modules, the substation, and the transmission line. The principal sources of noise are the cooling-ventilation fans, the electrical components of the inverters and the step-up transformers at the on-site substations. Gen-tie lines for Project 2 would be underground to the extent practicable, and therefore sound from the gen-tie line would not be perceptible. Additionally, because corona noise is typically attributed to higher voltage lines of approximately 345 kV and above, noise complaints from the Project's lower voltage transmission lines (66 kV) are not anticipated. Operational sound sources are all predicted to be less than 35 dBA at nearby noise-sensitive receptors, and would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.11-32; 4.11-33)**.

Project 2 is located 2.5 miles from Bohunk's Airpark and 6 miles from General William J. Fox Airfield. The airpark has very low use levels and no airfield noise contours have been developed.

However, due to low operation levels and distance from the airpark sound levels are assumed to be below 55 dBA CNEL. Sound contours have been produced for General William J. Fox Airfield; however, Project 2 is beyond the area included in the airport's land use compatibility plan (Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission 2004). As a result, no aviation land use restrictions are required. Project 2 would not create residential land uses, and all Project features are outside the airpark properties. Consequently, there are no impacts from airport-related noise. **(DEIR at 4.11-51)**.

Project 2 impacts related to Noise are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

N-1 Construction operations would not occur between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday, or at any time on Sunday with the exception of limited low-noise generating potential night work with Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning and Public Works approval.

N-2 Construction site and access road maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour shall be established and enforced during the construction period.

N-3 Electrically-powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, except for devices like trucks, loaders, dozers, and other heavy equipment.

N-4 Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far as practicable, and no closer than 1,000 feet, from noise-sensitive receptors.

N-5 The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells are prohibited except where required by OSHA or for safety or emergency warning purposes required by other regulatory agencies.

N-6 Project-related public address or music systems used on-site shall not be audible at any adjacent receptor.

N-7 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 which are in compliance with any applicable legally required equipment noise standards. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors) shall be equipped with shrouds and/or other noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment. Mobile sound barriers with a sound transmission class of 19 or greater will be used for pile driving on Projects where received sound levels at the nearest noise sensitive receptor are predicted to be above the County construction noise limit of 60 dBA during the day. With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site

substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may need to incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including:

N-8 Siting substations to achieve National Electrical Manufacturers Association ("NEMA") sound ratings at sensitive receptors as described in Section 4.11.5.2 not to be closer to the property line of sensitive receptors than the following distances for each individual project:

- Project 2 – 1,511 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 81 dBA

N-9 The Applicant shall use NEMA low noise rated transformer equipment which will achieve 10 dBA or greater noise reduction as compared to standard NEMA-rated transformers of a similar size and rated capacity to ensure that Project noise impacts would be less than significant.

2.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

Potential Effect:

Project 2 would have a significant impact on Public Services if it would create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection; sheriff protection; schools; parks; libraries, or other public facilities.

Finding:

Project 2 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Public Services. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 2 is located within the LACFD Battalion 11 service area. Station 140, which is 4.6 miles southeast of Project 2, is the jurisdictional station (i.e. the first-responder) to respond to incidents at the site. Additional fire stations within Battalion 11 (identified in DEIR Table 4.12-1) would also potentially be dispatched to respond to fire protection needs at the site.

During construction, workers would be temporary and would not be expected to relocate to the Project 2 area, as they would mostly be hired from the available local workforce, and would not be expected to result in significant changes to the local population; therefore, the construction of Project 2 is not anticipated to create significant changes to the local population that would increase the level of demand on fire protection services or that would increase the level of demand on the fire department services such that additional staff would be needed. **(DEIR at 4.12-7)**.

As discussed in DEIR Section 4.13, Transportation and Traffic, construction of Project 2 would not result in significant traffic impacts. However, Project 2 would involve construction of an underground 1.9-mile gen-tie line along 110th Street West and West Avenue J. Transmission line construction would require work in the public road ROW, including limited encroachment into the traveled roadway. It is anticipated that the construction of the Project 2 gen-tie lines would only require partial street closures, which provide better emergency access than full street closures. Approvals for Project 2 will require worksite traffic control plans, permits, and coordination with County departments regarding potential construction impacts to 110th Street West and West Avenue J. Additionally, the LACFD Fire Stations 140, 112, and 78 would be notified at a minimum of three days in advance of any street closures that may affect fire/paramedic responses in the area. In the event that construction of the Project 2 gen-tie line would require road closures, alternate route details (detour plans) and the schedule of closures would be submitted to the LACFD prior to construction. Implementation of traffic mitigation measure TT-3 would minimize potential effects to 110th Street West and West Avenue J such that the impact to LACFD access and response times would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-7)**.

Based on the Applicant's commitment to conformance of construction activities at the Project 2 site and gen-tie line ROW to federal, state, and Los Angeles County ordinances for fire protection, and implementation of mitigation related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials, construction would not be expected to result in significant special fire problems or hazards. Additionally, construction traffic at the site would not be anticipated to have a significant impact on local intersections and road segments. Therefore, Project 2 impacts to LACFD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-7)**.

Operations activities at Project 2 would typically be associated with routine maintenance carried out on-site and along the associated gen-tie ROWs at periodic intervals by a small maintenance crew. These activities would not result in effects to LACFD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection during operations of Project 2; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. In addition, the Applicant would be required to pay taxes as per the Proposition E Special Tax and property tax assessments, which are allocated to the LACFD. These taxes are designed to provide for potential increases in LACFD fire protection service demands to accommodate for new and existing developments. **(DEIR at 4.12-11).**

The Project 2 site is located within the LACSD Field Operations Region 1 service area. The Lancaster Station, which is approximately 10.7 miles northeast of Project 2, would likely be the first responder to incidents at the site. Currently the station maintains an officer-to-population service ratio of approximately 1 to 1,000. Project 2 does not involve any residential uses, and would not be considered to result in significant increases to population. During construction, workers would be temporary, and would not be expected to relocate to the area as they would mostly be hired from the available local workforce. The employees are planned to be hired from the available local workforce, and would not be expected to result in significant changes to the local population that would increase the level of demand on law enforcement services. **(DEIR at 4.12-11)**.

Sheriff services potentially required at Project 2 would likely include incidents of vandalism or theft. While these incidents would require sheriff services, they are not considered emergency response incidents, and as such would not affect emergency response times. As discussed in DEIR Section 4.13, Transportation and Traffic, construction of Project 2 would not result in significant traffic impacts. However, Project 2 Project 2 would involve construction of an underground 1.9-mile gen-tie line on 110th Street West and West Avenue J, which may require work in the public road ROW, and may potentially encroach into the traveled roadway. As a result, it is proposed to require worksite traffic control plans, permits, and coordination with County departments regarding potential construction impacts to 110th Street West and West Avenue J. Implementation of this would be expected to minimize potential effects to 110th Street West and West Avenue J such that the impact to LACSD access and response times would be less than significant. As a result, construction of Project 2 would be expected to result in less than significant effects to LACSD services and response times, such that Project 2 would not require additional LACSD staffing. Therefore, impacts from the construction of Project 2 to LACSD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for sheriff protection would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-12)**.

Project 2 and its associated gen-tie lines do not include residential development or the influx of long-term workers from outside the area, and accordingly would not generate population growth. Consequently, no new demands on school facilities, parks, library facilities or other public facilities are expected, and no impact would occur to these facilities. **(DEIR at 4.12-15; 4.12-16)**.

2.13 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Potential Effect:

Project 2 would have a significant impact on Transportation and Traffic if it would: conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit; 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; result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks; substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); result in inadequate emergency access; or conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 2 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Transportation and Traffic.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Traffic generated during the construction phase of Project 2 and its gen-tie line would include construction worker commuter trips, water truck trips, and delivery truck trips. Construction worker commuter trips and delivery truck trips are anticipated to arrive to the Project 2 site outside of peak hours. It is anticipated that 30 percent of water trucks would arrive to the Project site during the AM peak hour. Project 2 would have an average of 75 workers per day and a peak of 140 workers per day over a 20-day period during construction. For equipment and materials, Project 2 would have an average of 6 delivery truck trips per day with an expected peak of 26 delivery truck trips. It is anticipated that construction workers and delivery trucks would arrive to the Project 2 site outside of peak hours. **(DEIR at 4.13-29)**.

Dependent upon climatic conditions during construction, the maximum estimated water use for the Project 2 site is 94 acre-feet, which would be obtained from an off-site provider. Potable water would be brought in to the Project 2 site for drinking and domestic needs. During the site preparation and grading activities, water would mainly be used for soil compaction and control of fugitive dust generation. Smaller quantities of water would also be required on an as-needed basis for preparation of the concrete required for foundations and other minor uses. Subsequent to these construction activities, water usage would primarily be used for on-going dust suppression associated with the remaining construction of Project 2. Project 2 would require a total of 29 daily water truck trips arriving on-site. Assuming that 30 percent of the water trucks would arrive on-site during the AM peak hour (7:00 AM), 9 water trucks were used in this analysis. As shown in DEIR Tables 4.13-15 and 4.13-16, the local roads would experience a maximum increase in traffic volume of 32.14 percent during the AM peak hour. This is mainly due to the existing low volume and low peak traffic conditions for these roads, which are located in rural areas and operate well below the existing capacity of 1,600 vehicles per lane per hour for a 2-lane road. Therefore, it is concluded that these roads have adequate capacity to safely accommodate the increase from water truck traffic and would have a less than significant impact on the existing traffic conditions. **(DEIR at 4.13-28)**.

During construction of gen-tie lines associated with Project 2, it is anticipated that temporary, one-lane road closures would be necessary. A Project Traffic Plan would be prepared to address the temporary one-lane road closures and submitted to the County for approval prior to issuance/approval of the County Grading Permit as indicated in Mitigation Measure TT-2. Parking, temporary office trailers, and construction and PV equipment lay-down areas would be located entirely within the Project 2 site boundary. The construction impacts would be temporary and less than significant with mitigation. **(DEIR at 4.13-31)**.

The operational phase of Project 2 is anticipated to only generate an average of 4 additional vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hours on a quarterly or as-needed basis with a maximum of 12 additional trips, which would only occur when panel washing operations are being conducted. Based on the traffic analysis for the water truck trips described above, the operational phase vehicle trips are considered negligible. Therefore, no additional post-construction operational analysis was conducted. The operational phase of Project 2 would have a less than significant impact on the traffic and/or transportation infrastructure. **(DEIR at 4.13-31)**. Project 2 would not conflict with any applicable congestion management programs during the construction or operational phases. **(DEIR at 4.13-39)**.

Air traffic would not be impacted by implementation of Project 2. Project 2 would not include any buildings, structures, or other operations that would require a change in the existing air traffic patterns. The PV modules that would be used at the individual Project sites would be non-reflective and would not pose a hazard to air traffic. Gen-tie line components would be below the height limit and would not result in a change in existing air traffic patterns. **(DEIR at 4.13-39)**. The SGF would be connecting to the existing Southern California Edison Antelope Substation (SCEAS) via a gen-tie line approximately 2 miles long. Transmission line-related radio frequency interference ("RFI") is one of the indirect effects of transmission line operation. RFI is produced by the physical interactions of the electric fields generated by the transmission line. The level of RFI that occurs usually depends on the magnitude of the electric fields involved and the distance from the transmission line. It is usually associated with transmission lines of 345 kV or greater. The Project 2 transmission lines would connect to the SCEAS with a 66 kV gen-tie line (less than 345 kV) and would not adversely impact RFI effects. It is concluded that the operational phase of Project 2 would have less than significant impact on the traffic and/or transportation infrastructure. **(DEIR at 4.13-31)**.

No existing roads would be altered by Project 2, and Project 2 does not include design features or uses that would substantially increase any hazards. Parking, temporary office trailers, and construction and PV equipment lay-down areas would be located entirely within the Project 2 site boundary. Only temporary one-lane road closures are expected for the construction of the Gen-tie Lines. A Project Traffic Plan would be prepared to address the temporary one-lane road closures and submitted to the County for approval prior to issuance/approval of the Grading Permit. Therefore, Project 2 would not result in inadequate emergency access. Project 2 is located in rural areas of Los Angeles County and would not significantly decrease the performance or safety of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. **(DEIR at 4.13-40)**.

Project 2 impacts related to Transportation and Traffic are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

TT-1 Prior to issuance of a grading permit, Applicant shall document and submit all required information and/or material pertaining to the pavement conditions of construction routes for the Projects, including the formula for calculation of the Projects' fair share of any repair or reconstruction of construction routes to the satisfaction of LACDPW. Applicant shall reimburse the County of Los Angeles for the cost of any repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes attributable to the Projects as agreed to by LACDPW. The timing of any necessary repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes and the required payment by the Applicant shall be determined by LACDPW.

TT-2 Prior to any construction activities and/or issuance of required encroachment permits from Los Angeles County, the Applicant shall prepare worksite traffic control plans for review and approval from LACDPW and other affected agencies for any closures, partial closures of public streets, or work within or adjacent to the road right-of-way that impacts the movement of traffic. The Plans shall be prepared in accordance with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (2012).

TT-3 Additionally, the County, including LACFD Fire Stations 78 (for R2011-00801) and 130 (for R2011-000798, 00799, 00805,00807, & 00833) shall be notified at least three days in advance of any street closures that may affect fire and/or paramedic responses in the area. The Applicant shall provide alternate route (detour) plans to the County, including three sets to LACFD, with a tentative schedule of planned closures, prior to the beginning of construction.

TT-4 Stagger construction work shifts before or after peak traffic hours.

TT-5 Schedule truck deliveries during off peak hours.

TT-6 Limit water truck deliveries during the AM peak hour to 30 percent of the daily water truck trips. All other trips shall be at off peak hours.

TT-7 Prior to start of construction activities, Applicant shall provide worker education encouraging carpooling and vanpooling by workers and shall provide assistance for organizing vanpools and carpools. A log will be developed to show compliance.

2.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Potential Effect:

Project 2 would have a significant impact on Utilities and Service Systems if it would: exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards; create water or wastewater system capacity problems, 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; create drainage system capacity problems, 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; not have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses; create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; or create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Finding:

Project 2 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Utilities and Service Systems. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The construction of Project 2 and its associated gen-tie lines would generate temporary and limited wastewater as a result of on-site construction workers. The wastewater generated would be collected at the on-site mobile sanitation facilities and then transported to a nearby wastewater disposal facility. In the event that additional wastewater is generated from construction activities, water would be stored in an on-site tank system and would be disposed of at an approved wastewater treatment facility. Construction and operational wastewater will be limited in quantity and significantly below wastewater treatment requirements of Los Angeles County and the RWQCB. **(DEIR at 4.14-14)**.

All wastewater would be treated according to the treatment requirements enforced by the NPDES permit authorized by the Lahonton Regional Water Quality Control Board ("LRWQCB"). Additionally, semi-annual washing of the PV modules would generate minimal wastewater during operation. However, since the wash water would only consist of demineralized water and dust washed off of the modules, it would not need to be treated at a wastewater treatment facility. This wash water would be allowed to infiltrate into the ground and evaporate as it drips off the PV modules. The wastewater generated from maintenance workers would be collected at the on-site temporary mobile sanitation facilities and then transported to a nearby wastewater treatment facility. Project 2 would not exceed the requirements of LRWQCB, and therefore impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-14)**. Likewise, construction and operation of Project 2 would not exceed the capacity of any treatment plant and would have no impact to a wastewater system. Consequently, no new wastewater treatment facilities would need to be created and no existing facilities would need to be expanded. The maximum construction water use of Project 2 is 94 acre feet, and the maximum operational water use of Project 2 is 5.8 acre feet per year. No water system capacity problems would be created and no new water systems or expansion of existing systems would be required. **(DEIR at 4.14-16)**.

Project Site 2 currently drains from west to east; the post-development condition would maintain this flow path. A SWPPP incorporating BMPs for temporary stormwater management would be prepared and approved before the construction of Project 2 and its gen-tie lines. The final design of Project 2 would allow the pre-development runoff amount to continue to sheet flow in the post-development condition to avoid disturbance to downstream drainage structures or wildlife. The design of Project 2 would eliminate the need for new drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, Project 2 would have a less than significant impact on drainage facilities. **(DEIR at 4.14-18)**.

The construction for Project 2 and the Project 2 gen-tie lines would create a short-term temporary demand for water, primarily in association with dust control. The Applicant would provide a Dust Control Plan to the County prior to the start of construction activities. The plan would detail site-specific dust control measures designed to minimize water use during construction activities, while minimizing fugitive dust emissions. Project 2's maximum construction water use is 94 ac-ft. Although the Project 2 site was not historically used for agriculture, it is estimated that a property of that size (157 acres) would require at least 408 AFY of water for agriculture. Thus, the maximum construction water use of Project 2 is substantially less than the best estimate of water use of 408 AFY for agriculture, which was historically the

primary land use of surrounding land. Based on potential estimated historic groundwater use at the site, there may be adequate groundwater supply within the western portion of the Basin to meet Project 2's construction water needs. In addition, according to the Antelope Valley Integrated Regional Water Management Plan ("IRWMP"), groundwater is considered a reliable water source in the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin.

However, given that the Adjudication will not likely be resolved during construction of Project 2, water for Project 2 would be supplied via truck from either Homer LLC, or the City of Lancaster, both of which have provided "Will Serve" letters indicating their ability to meet the water demands of Project 2. Homer LLC would provide out-of- Basin water stored in the Antelope Valley Water Bank. Potential recycled water providers are Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40, Los Angeles County Sanitation District, and Palmdale Water District. The City of Lancaster has a current supply capacity of approximately 16 million gallons per day of treated wastewater that is suitable for construction use and panel washing. **(Final EIR at p. 256)**.

As previously discussed, the potential estimated historical agricultural water usage for the Project 2 site was determined to be at least 408 AFY. Project 2's maximum construction water use is 94 ac-ft, which equates to 77 percent less than the potential estimated historical annual agricultural groundwater usage at the site. Either of the sources noted above would have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the Project 2 construction demands from existing water source entitlements and water resources. Therefore the impacts from water usage during construction would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-21)**.

During operations, the maximum water use for Project 2 would be 5.8 AFY. A maximum of 5.8 AFY of additional water may be needed in the first 2 years of operation to establish the plants for the landscaping buffer. It is unlikely, but possible that additional water (up to 5.8 AFY) may be needed later during the operations phase for supplemental plantings if landscape vegetation expires and has to be replaced. As with the Project 2 water needs during construction, during operations Homer LLC would also provide out-of-Basin water stored in the Antelope Valley Water Bank. This option would provide a reliable source of water for operations. Potential recycled water providers are Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40, Los Angeles County Sanitation District, and Palmdale Water District. The City of Lancaster has a current supply capacity of approximately 16 million gallons per day of treated wastewater that is suitable for construction use and panel washing. **(Final EIR at p. 256)**. Therefore, the impacts from water usage during operations would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-21)**.

Project 2 and its associated gen-tie lines do not require natural gas or propane during construction or operation; therefore there would be no system capacity problems for those utilities. Since natural gas and propane are not needed for Project 2, no new energy facilities would need to be created, and no existing facilities would need to be expanded. Project 2 may require electricity for the construction equipment and for lighting construction activities. The electricity would likely come from one of the existing SCE lines located on the west and south sides of the site. Electricity consumption during construction would be temporary, and would vary depending on the phase of construction. Overall, the construction of Project 2 would require

limited electrical consumption that the existing electrical grid has capacity to serve. Therefore, Project 2 would have a less than significant impact on energy utility system capacity during construction. **(DEIR at 4.14-25)**.

Project 2 would also require electricity for ongoing maintenance operations, lighting, security systems, and other various operational needs. During daylight hours, the electricity needs for Project 2 would be supplied by Project 2's electricity generation. During non-daylight hours, the electricity needs for Project 2 would be provided by either backfeed from the electrical grid, through the proposed gen-tie, or through the existing SCE lines located on the west and south sides of the Project 2 site. Therefore, Project 2 would have a less than significant impact on energy utility system capacity. **(DEIR at 4.14-26)**.

Construction of Project 2 would require minimal ground disturbance during the facility installation. Solid waste generated from construction of Project 2 (and gentie lines) may include paper, wood, glass, plastics from packing material, waste lumber, insulation, scrap metal and concrete, empty non-hazardous containers, and vegetation wastes. In accordance with Title 22 Chapter 22.52, 65 percent of construction and demolition debris would be recycled. Any material that cannot be recycled would be properly disposed of at a regional disposal facility. Any defective or broken solar modules would be returned to the manufacturer for recycling. In accordance with Title 22 Chapter 20.87, the Applicant would prepare a Recycling and Reuse Plan and progress reports to implement and document the Project's recycling practices. Therefore, Project 2 construction impacts on landfill and solid waste disposal capacity would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-26)**. Once the SGF is installed, there would be minimal waste generated during Project 2 operations; therefore Project 2 will have a less than significant impact on landfill and solid waste disposal capacity during operations. **(DEIR at 4.14-27)**.

Non-hazardous waste generated during construction, operation, and decommissioning of Project 2 (and gen-tie lines) would be transferred by licensed waste hauling contractors and recycled or disposed of in compliance with local and state regulations. Hazardous wastes would be shipped offsite and treated or disposed in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations for hazardous waste management. The construction contractor would prepare a Project-specific hazardous materials management and hazardous waste management program for Project 2. Project 2 would have no impact relative to compliance with existing federal or state regulations pertaining to solid waste, because Project 2 would be required to comply with all relevant regulations during construction, operation and decommissioning. **(DEIR at 4.14-27)**.

SECTION 3.0 FINDINGS REGARDING CUMULATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH ARE NOT SIGNIFICANT OR WHICH HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

Pursuant to Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines, the following findings and statements of fact identify potentially significant cumulative impacts and Project 2's incremental contribution to the impacts discussed in the Final EIR, in the context of the other five Projects and other cumulative projects. For the following environmental resource areas, Project 2's incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable, and no cumulatively significant impact will occur.

3.1 AESTHETICS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 2), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Aesthetics.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 2, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects. Project 2, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Aesthetics.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Individually, with mitigation, each of the six proposed SGF Projects can each be expected to have a less than significant impact on aesthetic resources. The Project sites comprise 987.1 acres, or 0.6 percent of the total area within the 5 mile radius. Within the 5-mile radius area, there are 20,909 acres of development listed by individual projects, as shown in DEIR Table 3-7. These development projects, including the Applicant's Projects, comprise 12.6 percent of the area identified in DEIR Figure 3-5 and include solar projects, commercial projects, and residential projects.

From elevated viewpoints, the western Antelope Valley appears as a mosaic of agricultural lands, suburban developments, and open land. From a distance, the proposed SGFs would not appear dissimilar to agricultural fields or existing PV facilities in shape and size. The other solar and real estate developments proposed for the western Antelope Valley would not appear dissimilar to existing land use patterns. From level viewpoints, such as those along local roads, solar or residential/commercial developments would not be prominent unless the observer is directly adjacent to the facility. Because of the flat nature of the Antelope Valley landscape, developments would quickly become less prominent as the viewer travels away from them. In addition, the scenic character on the valley floor is generally low. Existing commercial, residential, and energy developments (including substations, high-voltage transmission lines, distribution lines, and generation facilities) are scattered throughout the valley.

A 12.6 percent level of increase in development within 5 miles of each of the Project sites is not anticipated to be significant from elevated or level viewpoints, because the proposed developments would appear similar to existing developments in the Antelope Valley, and cover only a very small portion of the land within 5 miles of each proposed Project site. Views of open desert lands would still exist, and the flatness of the landscape would limit the prominence of new developments with increasing distance.

The proposed Projects and other proposed projects within the cumulative impacts study area would be individually required to comply with the Los Angeles County General Plan goals and policies, and the Antelope Valley Area Plan policies, as well as applicable ordinances such as the

Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance, as they are applicable to aesthetic resources, as identified in Section 4.1.3 of the DEIR. Any cumulative aesthetic impacts would be reduced to a level that is less than significant with mitigation by application of these regulations, and mitigation measures A-1 to A-5. **(DEIR at 4.1-114 to 4.1-115)**.

3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Cumulative impacts to Agriculture and Forestry Resources could occur in the event that Project 2, in conjunction with the six proposed SGF Projects and other cumulative projects results in the area results in a cumulatively significant loss of Important Farmlands or Williamson Act contracted lands.

Finding:

Project 2, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Agriculture and Forestry Resources. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see DEIR Table 3-7). For the purposes of this cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable law ordinances regulations and standards.

Projects 1 – 6 are located in a region with significant agricultural uses. However, the Antelope Valley has been historically and is currently limited by water costs and climate conditions. Cumulatively, the Projects would not develop land classified as Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Project 4 is the only site that currently contains land designated as Prime Farmland and of Statewide Importance. As mentioned above, the DOC is in process of reclassifying Project 4 land currently mapped as Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance to Grazing Land on the 2012 edition of the Important Farmland Map for Los Angeles County. The Projects would not be expected to contribute to the overall trend of conversion of agricultural lands to other uses in the Antelope Valley when considered together with other potential cumulative projects in the area. That said, it is contemplated that at the end of the anticipated 35-year life of Projects 1-6, the associated properties could be returned to agricultural use. The Projects' incremental contribution to cumulative agricultural impacts is considered less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-9)**.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 2), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Air Quality.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 2, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Air Quality. Project 2, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Air Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Twenty-nine related projects have been identified within the proposed Projects' vicinity; locations are listed in DEIR Figure 4.3-2, "Cumulative Projects in the Region". Of these 29 related projects, there are a number of related projects that have not yet been built or are currently under construction. Since the Applicant has no control over the timing or sequencing of the related projects, and the level of emissions that would be generated by the related projects is uncertain, it is infeasible and speculative to prepare a quantitative analysis to ascertain daily construction emissions that would occur under a worst-case scenario of all 29 related projects being constructed concurrently with the Applicant's six Projects.

For this reason, the AVAQMD was consulted to assess the cumulative impact resulting only from the Applicant's six Projects. The County's EIR consultant (Tetra Tech) met with AVAQMD officials and technical staff at the AVAQMD's office on May 29, 2012, and discussed the proper cumulative Air Quality analysis methodology for the Project pursuant to CEQA. **(DEIR at 4.3-48)**. AVAQMD determined that cumulative impacts from the Applicant's six Projects should be cumulatively quantified based on size, construction equipment per phase, and construction phase duration, and that the related projects should only be qualitatively discussed within the EIR. The cumulative Air Quality analysis was performed based on the direction from AVAQMD, and included the analysis of concurrent construction and operation emissions sources on any one maximum construction day, air dispersion modeling method, and risk assessment method. **(DEIR at 4.3-48)**.

As previously discussed in the analyses above (DEIR Table 4.3-13, "Peak Annual Construction Emissions"; DEIR Table 4.3-20, "Peak Annual Operation Emissions"; and DEIR Table 4.3-22, "Concurrent Health Risk Assessment"), emissions from overlapping construction phases of the Applicant's six projects would not exceed the AVAQMD thresholds on any maximum day or year during construction or operations. **(DEIR 4.3-30; 4.3-49)**.

With respect to the Project's construction-period air quality emissions and cumulative Basin-wide conditions, the AVAQMD has developed strategies to reduce criteria pollutant emissions outlined in the Air Quality Management Plan ("AQMP") pursuant to CAA mandates. As such,

Project 2 would comply with AVAQMD Rule 403 requirements, and implement all feasible mitigation measures. In addition, Project 2 would comply with adopted AQMP emissions control measures. Per AVAQMD rules and mandates and the CEQA requirement that significant impacts be mitigated to the extent feasible, these same requirements (i.e., Rule 403 compliance, the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, and compliance with adopted AQMP emissions control measures) would also be imposed on construction projects Basin-wide, which would include each of the related projects mentioned below. **(DEIR 4.3-49)**.

By applying AVAQMD's cumulative air quality impact methodology, implementation of Projects 1 – 6 would not result in an addition of pollutants, such that considerable cumulative impacts in conjunction with related projects in the region would occur. Therefore, the emissions of nonattainment pollutants and precursors generated cumulatively by Projects 1 – 6 would be less than significant. Projects are deemed inconsistent with air quality plans when they result in population and/or employment growth that exceeds growth estimates in the applicable air quality plan. The SGF sites would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, which in this case is the Federal 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan (Western Mojave Desert Nonattainment Area). The Ozone Attainment Plan relies upon future year emission inventories consistent with California Air Resource Board ("CARB") and the adopted General Plan growth projections. As the proposed Projects are not part of an ongoing regulatory program, the AVAQMD recommends Project-specific air quality impacts be used to determine the potential cumulative impacts to regional air quality. As discussed above, peak daily emissions of operation-related pollutants would not exceed AVAQMD significance thresholds.

The combined Projects' emission estimates state that while Projects 1 – 6 would generate air emissions during construction and a minimal amount of GHG emissions during operations, the Projects' incremental contribution, with mitigation, to cumulative air quality impacts do not exceed any air quality significance thresholds and would comply with the applicable AVAQMD AQMP. It should be noted that solar energy provided by the Projects is a much cleaner source of energy than traditional sources used for the generation of electricity, such as the burning of coal, fuel oil, or natural gas. Furthermore, since the percentage of GHG emissions generated by Projects 1 – 6 is so small; Projects 1 – 6 would provide a *de minimis* contribution to significant cumulative impacts caused by other projects in the region (as further discussed in DEIR Section 4.7, Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas). The Projects' emissions of non-attainment pollutants and precursors generated during operations with mitigation would not exceed the AVAQMD Project-level thresholds and are less than significant. As a result, Project-level emissions would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution, such that results in an increase in air pollutant emissions above those assumed in the regional AQMP. **(DEIR at 4.3-52)**.

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 2), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Biological Resources.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 2, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Biological Resources. Project 2, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Biological Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The total area included in the map in DEIR Figure 3-17 showing a 5.0 mile radius outward from each of the Project 1 – 6 solar sites comprises 165,349 acres. Solar development in the area is 8,086 acres (4.9 percent of the 165,349 acres shown in DEIR Figure 3-17). The Silverado Projects cover 987 acres (only 0.6 percent of the total area). Open space and wildlife mitigation lands would be acquired and preserved in perpetuity for Projects 1 – 6. Since the mitigation lands are intended to comprise higher quality wildlife habitat than those impacted by the Projects, impacts will be mitigated. The permanent nature of the land mitigation and preservation program to be implemented would assure that these new wildlife habitat mitigation lands would always be maintained and enhanced for wildlife values. Therefore, cumulative impacts from the Project would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.4-71)**.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 2), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Cultural Resources.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 2, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Cultural Resources. Project 2, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Cultural Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. As described above under impacts specific to Project 2, impacts related to cultural resources would be mitigated to less than significant levels, since the CRHR and NRHP eligible resources in the area would be avoided. Because impacts to cultural resources would be mitigated to less than significant through avoidance, Projects 1 – 6 would not result in an incremental increase in effects on cultural resources when combined with the other

29 projects. Therefore, no significant cumulative impacts would be expected to occur. **(DEIR at 4.5-35)**.

3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 2), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Geology and Soils.

Finding:

Project 2, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Geology and Soils. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). For the purposes of this cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time.

It is assumed that construction of all of the cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards, and that geotechnical studies would be performed to assess and mitigate any geotechnical hazards associated with them; therefore, the cumulative projects would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects. It is also assumed that the cumulative projects would comply with all applicable erosion control and stormwater management laws, ordinances, regulations and standards, therefore the construction of the cumulative projects would not contribute to cumulative soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

Proposed Projects 1 – 6 would not expose the public to adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking because the Projects would be contained within a secure fenced area at each location and not open to the public. The potential for injury to workers is also quite low as they will not be on-site the majority of the time, and the likelihood that a seismic event would occur when workers are present is quite small. The Projects would also not result in significant soil erosion because the design and construction of the Projects' facilities would comply with all applicable building codes and standards established by regulatory agencies, including Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the CBC. The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would therefore not contribute incrementally to cumulative impacts resulting from other development within the 5-mile radius. **(DEIR at 4.6-27)**.

3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 2), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 2, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change. Project 2, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15355, a "cumulative impact" is an environmental effect that may result from the combination of two or more environmental effects associated with a proposed project, or from the combination of one or more project environmental effects with related environmental effects caused by other closely related projects. However, in the case of global climate change, the proximity of the Projects to other GHG-generating activities is not directly relevant to the determination of a cumulative impact. Although AB 32 sets statewide targets for future GHG emissions, the scoping plan and other implementing tools of the law are clear that the reductions are not expected to occur uniformly from all sources or sectors. The conclusions related specifically to Project 2, above, highlights the manner by which the proposed Projects intend to meet many of these strategies.

Numerous options exist for project developers to reduce their contribution to city-, county-, and state-wide GHG emissions, while helping to meet the region’s future housing, jobs, and infrastructure needs. However, it is not possible at this time to accurately quantify GHG emissions expected from the related Projects or the GHG reductions anticipated from the above-listed strategies. There is no certain basis for concluding that an emissions increase resulting from the Projects and the related Projects could cause a measurable increase in global GHG emissions sufficient to force global climate change due to the complex physical, chemical and atmospheric mechanisms involved in global climate change.

In addition, the emissions models used for Project-level evaluations do not fully reflect improvements in technology and other reductions in GHG emissions that are likely to occur pursuant to state regulations, such as AB 1493, SB 1368, AB 32, and Executive Order S-3-5, as well as future federal and/or state regulations. Therefore, it is not possible or meaningful to calculate emissions from each of the identified related Projects and compare that with a numeric threshold or reduction target. Projects 1-6 would be consistent with the state’s goals in helping the state meet the RPS (DEIR Table 4.7-17), resulting in a GHG emission profile that is below established thresholds, and include implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-1 to GHG-5.

Therefore, the Projects do not contribute considerably to cumulatively significant global climate change impacts. **(DEIR at 4.7-31)**.

3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 2), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 2, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Project 2, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see Table 3-7). For the purposes of this cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. It is assumed that for each of the cumulative projects, Hazardous Materials Management Plans and Hazardous Waste Management Plans would be implemented, a SWPPP would be prepared, and all applicable environmental due diligence would be conducted (i.e., a Phase I ESA). If any of the cumulative projects are within an airport land use plan or airport influence area, the projects would obtain the appropriate authorizations and permitting from the respective Airport Land Use Commission. The cumulative projects would have a less than significant impact with mitigation to hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the land uses in the surrounding areas (primarily agricultural) and the limited amount and type of hazardous materials to be used as part of the proposed Projects 1 – 6, no significant incremental cumulative impacts associated with environmental safety are expected to occur as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed Projects 1 – 6. Regulations implemented by the Department of Toxic Substance Control ("DTSC"), LACSD, LACFD, and Cal/OSHA would require similar measures be applied to other developments in the region. Therefore, Projects 1 – 6 are not expected to result in significant incremental cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. **(DEIR at 4.8-19 to 4.8-20)**.

3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 2), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 2, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Hydrology and Water Quality. Project 2, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Project sites, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-3). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws ordinances regulations and standards. Projects located within 5 miles of the proposed Projects entail the geographic extent under consideration of cumulative impacts. The proposed Projects are six of several proposed renewable development projects that would impact existing and proposed land uses within the general Project area. As shown in DEIR Table 3-7 and DEIR Figure 3-17, the proposed Projects would entail approximately 0.60 percent of all proposed projects within a 5-mile radius.

All cumulative projects that may be approved and implemented would also assess potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality. The proposed Projects 1 – 6 were found to have less than significant impacts related to erosion, flooding, debris deposition, and stormwater quality, with no off-site impacts. Additionally, the proposed Projects would not result in any significant or unavoidable impacts and represent a small fraction of the total amount of lands affected by renewable projects and foreseeable projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects. Therefore, the proposed Projects would not be expected to significantly contribute to potential cumulative impacts associated with other projects in the Projects' region. **(DEIR at 4.9-45)**.

3.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 2), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Land Use and Planning.

Finding:

Project 2, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Land Use and Planning. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6. The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards. **(DEIR at 4.10-43)**.

Projects located within 5 miles of the proposed Projects entail the geographic extent under consideration of cumulative impacts. The proposed Projects are six of several proposed renewable development projects that would impact existing and proposed land uses within the general Project area. Similar potential impacts can result from these projects as from the Projects with respect to consistency with the subject general plan land use plans and policies, impacts to compatibility with surrounding land uses, and regulatory compliance with zoning ordinances. All cumulative projects that may be approved and implemented would also assess potential impacts related to land use and planning. The proposed Projects were found to have less than significant impacts related to compliance with County zoning, consistency with the County General Plan Land Use Plan intent and applicable land use conformance criteria, dividing an existing community, and with no significant impacts to the adjacent City of Lancaster. Additionally, the proposed Projects would not result in any significant or unavoidable land use impacts and represent a small fraction of the total amount of lands affected by renewable projects and foreseeable projects within a 5 mile radius of the Projects. Therefore, the proposed Projects would not be expected to significantly contribute to potential cumulative land use related impacts associated with other projects in the region. **(DEIR at 4.10-44)**.

3.11 NOISE

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 2), have the potential to result in cumulative Noise impacts.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 2, which mitigate or avoid significant Noise impacts. Project 2, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant Noise impact.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Two non-Applicant projects identified have the potential to result in cumulative construction noise impacts, due to the projects being located in relatively close proximity to the proposed Projects, but not close enough to result in vibration impacts. The Western Antelope Dry Ranch project (CUP 11-07) is located approximately 1-mile north of Project 2, and the High Desert LLC (CUP 10-03) project is located approximately 1-mile north of Project 4. These distances are close enough that construction noise could propagate out to distances near the Applicant's Projects, but are not close enough to potentially result in vibration impacts. The time period of construction for these two projects is unknown, but if construction were to overlap with construction of the proposed Projects, there is the potential for increased temporary noise levels at residences; however, none of the noise sensitive receptors that are located in close proximity to Project 4 are also located in close proximity to Antelope Solar 1 or Antelope Solar Farm projects. Therefore, sound levels from construction of the Projects would only be minimally increased (less than 1-2 dBA), or not at all, by simultaneous construction. Therefore, overall cumulative impacts of the proposed Projects 1 – 6 would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures N-1 to N-9. **(DEIR at 4.11-56)**.

3.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 2), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Public Services.

Finding:

Project 2, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Public Services. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Projects amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. It is assumed that for each of the cumulative projects, worksite traffic control plans, permits, and coordination with County departments regarding potential construction impacts would be implemented. **(DEIR at 4.12-16)**.

Projects 1 – 6 would not cause effects to result in significant demands to fire response times. Projects 1 – 6 would be designed with appropriate fire protection considerations, and would also result in less than significant impacts to staffing and response times. Furthermore, Projects 1 – 6 would be required to provide taxes to the County that are designed to address cumulative fire department needs associated with new and existing developments. Other developments in the vicinity of Projects 1 – 6 would also be required to pay taxes and fees to the County to provide

for their potential increase to LACFD fire protection service demands (LACFD 2009). Additionally, all development in the area is subject to review and approval by the Fire Department. This ensures that all projects contain appropriate controls to reduce demand on the fire department. As a result, Projects 1 – 6 would be anticipated to result in less than significant incremental contributions to cumulative fire protection impacts. **(DEIR at 4.12-17)**.

Projects 1 – 6 would not cause effects to result in significant demands to sheriff staffing or response times. Projects 1 – 6 would also implement site security control, including 24-hour remotely monitored video cameras for security monitoring to prevent potential theft and vandalism activities. Additionally, a portion of Projects 1 – 6 taxes levied would be allocated to sheriff services. Other developments in the vicinity of Projects 1 – 6 would also be required to pay taxes that would be allocated to sheriff services. As a result, construction and operation of Projects 1 – 6 would be anticipated to result in less than significant incremental contributions to cumulative sheriff protection impacts. Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with sheriff services would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-17)**.

Because development of Projects 1-6 will not induce population growth, no direct or cumulative impacts to schools, parks, libraries or other public facilities will occur. **(DEIR at 4.12-15; 4.12-16)**.

3.13 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 2), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Transportation and Traffic.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 2, which mitigate or avoid significant impacts to Transportation and Traffic. Project 2, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Transportation and Traffic.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Cumulative impacts for transportation and traffic are the combined effect of Projects 1 – 6 with the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects (other projects). This Cumulative Impacts discussion addresses the cumulative impacts of the Applicant's Projects 1 – 6 and the other projects within a geographic radius of 5-mile radius of the Projects (Project Study Area), which could potentially coincide with the expected construction schedule of the Applicant's Projects. Based on evaluation of the Project Study Area and available data from Los Angeles County, there are 29 other projects that have the potential to contribute additional traffic volume within the vicinity of Projects 1-6.

Evaluation of the cumulative impacts within the Project Study Area was focused on the construction-phase traffic for Projects 1-6 and other projects within a 5-mile radius. As previously stated in the individual conclusions for Project 2 above, the operational phase for each Project is anticipated to only generate a maximum of 4 vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hours on a quarterly or as-needed basis with a maximum of 12 additional trips, which would only occur when panel washing operations are being conducted. Based on the traffic analysis contained in the DEIR, the operational phase vehicle trips/traffic for the Projects are considered negligible and would not result in a significant cumulative impact on the traffic and/or transportation infrastructure in the Project Study Area. **(DEIR at 4.13-41 to 4.13-43)**.

3.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 2), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Utilities and Service Systems.

Finding:

Project 2, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Utilities and Service Systems. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, and regulations. Construction and operation of the cumulative projects would result in less than significant impacts to public facilities, which include electricity, gas, wastewater, and solid waste services. During construction, all cumulative projects would follow required measures to prevent construction interference to utility services, and would comply with recycling requirements to minimize solid waste disposal at solid waste facilities. During operation, the solar and wind generation projects would provide electricity, and would generate minimal amounts of solid waste. During operation, the non-solar/non-wind commercial and residential development projects would generate solid waste as would be expected from these residential and commercial uses; it is assumed that these project proponents have planned for and mitigated for the additional solid waste generation as appropriate.

The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would provide their own electricity for operational needs, no natural gas would be required for their operations, little wastewater (from panel washing) would be generated as part of the operations process, and very little solid waste would be generated. As a result, the total cumulative impacts to utility services would be less than significant, and the incremental contribution of Projects 1 – 6 to cumulative impacts related to utility services would

be less than significant. Furthermore, because the Applicant has committed to using out of Basin water during construction and operations, Projects 1 – 6 would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to water supply impacts in the Basin, and would have no significant cumulative effect on water supply. **(DEIR at 4.14-28)**.

SECTION 4.0 FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

These Findings and Statements of Fact regarding project alternatives and certain mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR are set forth to comply with Section 21002 of the Public Resources Code and Sections 15091(a)(3) and 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines. Five alternatives to the proposed Project (consisting of Projects 1-6) described in the Draft EIR were analyzed and considered as follows: 1) No Project Alternative; 2) Lower Intensity Projects; 3) Select Other Project Sites Alternative; 4) Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative; and 5) Wind Energy Generation Alternative. These alternatives constitute a reasonable range of alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. For the reasons set forth below, Alternatives 1-5 are rejected as infeasible for the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations set forth below.

4.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Description:

Under the No Project Alternative, Project sites 1-6 would remain in their present condition with site conditions (i.e., fallow agricultural land) as they currently exist.

Finding:

The No Project Alternative is rejected as infeasible because it fails to meet the Project goals and objectives, and would not contribute to the State's ability to meet its near- and long-term renewable energy generation goals and objectives.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would not be approved or implemented under the No Project Alternative. The potential environmental impacts and benefits of the proposed Projects would not occur as a direct consequence of implementation under the No Project Alternative. The No Project Alternative would involve taking no action to generate 172 MW of clean, renewable electrical power utilizing solar PV technology and to integrate the electrical output of the Projects into the electrical grid. This alternative would not allow one of the primary purposes of the proposed Projects which is to increase the output of renewable energy in support of the RPS, such that the State of California may meet its current and planned goals for increasing renewable generation at reasonable market rates.

The No Project Alternative assumes that the sites will remain as they currently exist (primarily fallow agricultural land) and no environmental impacts would result. In summary, the No Project Alternative is provided for comparative purposes to the proposed Projects 1 – 6. This alternative is incapable of meeting the stated goals and objectives of the Projects to provide 172 MW of

renewable electric energy to utility providers, and does not contribute to the state's ability to meet its near-term and long-term renewable energy generation goals and objectives. **(DEIR 5-1 to 5-2)**.

4.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: LOWER INTENSITY PROJECTS

Description:

Under the Lower Intensity Projects Alternative, fewer than six sites would be developed, and the smaller projects would be developed in a size and configuration that would result in generation of fewer than 172 MW of electricity.

Finding:

The Lower Intensity Projects Alternative is rejected as infeasible because it partially fails to accomplish the goals of the proposed Projects, which are to provide 172 MW of clean, renewable electric energy using solar PV technology, and to deliver the electric output on a wholesale basis to utility providers.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Projects 1-6 are designed to meet the increasing demand for clean, renewable electrical power. Any reduction in the size of the effort results in a similar potential reduction in the reliance on foreign sources of fuel, the diversification of energy portfolios, the contribution to the reduction of GHG emissions, and the generation of "green" jobs. It would also potentially reduce the contribution to the much needed on-peak power to the electrical grid in California.

The opportunity to develop solar power in Los Angeles County has a limited timeframe because the utility companies, which purchase the power, would purchase power from another entity if the proposed Projects are not completed in a timely manner. If Los Angeles County does not approve the six viable SGFs proposed here, the opportunity to contribute to the competitive solar generation business in the County will be further lost to other projects. The proposed Projects are well-positioned to compete in the industry, are comparatively environmentally superior to most other locations, and have good positions for PPAs and interconnection agreements. Additionally, any reduction of the megawatts produced from these Projects would further limit the County's contribution to the State's renewable energy production goals. These 5 to 52 MW Projects meet the utility industry needs for small projects, and any reduction of the respective Projects' size would jeopardize the success of the Projects. **(DEIR at 5-2)**.

4.3 ALTERNATIVE 3: SELECT OTHER PROJECT SITES ALTERNATIVE

Description:

Under the Select Other Project Sites Alternative, other properties could potentially be used for the six Project sites.

Finding:

The Select Other Project Sites Alternative is rejected, because this alternative would have the same or greater impacts to the environment as Projects 1-6, which can all be mitigated to below a level of significance.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

One key objective for the Project Applicant was to locate the Projects in an area with the following characteristics: (1) adequate solar radiation; (2) close proximity to interconnection locations for each solar site; (3) project sites with landowners who are willing to sell large enough parcels of land for solar generation at market price; (4) lack of threatened and/or endangered biological species on the site; (5) lack of nearby sensitive receptors or land uses to minimize potential conflicts with development (6) relatively flat sites that have previously been disturbed to minimize disturbance to native habitat and to minimize the need for site grading; (7) existing access to accommodate construction workforce needs; and (8) access to nearby workforce to minimize traffic and socioeconomic impacts. The Applicant performed in-depth analyses of over 10,000 acres of land in the Western Antelope Valley, as shown in DEIR Figure 6-1. Of the 10,000 acres screened, only ten percent met the criteria listed above.

The six Project sites selected and proposed by the Applicant are the most viable sites to develop solar electricity generation with minimal environmental impacts. These sites were also chosen for development based on interconnection capacity and requirements placed on the Applicant by the utility providers. Selection of other alternative sites would have the same or greater impacts to the environment since the present Projects are the result of a long and intense effort by the Applicant to find and acquire the most suitable sites according to the criteria given above. **(DEIR at 1-6; 5-3)**. Furthermore, the environmental impacts for Projects 1-6 can all be mitigated to below a level of significance.

4.4 ALTERNATIVE 4: ROOFTOP SOLAR GENERATION

Description:

Under the Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative, solar photovoltaic panels would be installed on private rooftops.

Finding:

The Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative is rejected as infeasible, because the Project Applicant does not have the ability to install solar panels on private rooftops.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

For rooftop solar to be a viable alternative to the proposed Projects it would need to provide 172 MW of electricity into the local grid. Assuming one residential installation can produce 25 kilowatts of electricity, a total of 6,880 residential installations would be needed to produce 172

MW of electricity. The Applicant does not have the ability to install solar panels on private rooftops; therefore this alternative is not feasible for the Applicant. **(DEIR at 5-3)**.

4.5 ALTERNATIVE 5: WIND ENERGY GENERATION

Description:

Under the Wind Energy Generation Alternative, electricity would be generated through the use of wind turbines.

Finding:

The Wind Energy Generation Alternative is rejected as infeasible, because the type of geographical location that is suitable for a wind farm is not available within the vicinity.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

For wind energy generation to be a reasonable alternative to the proposed Projects and meet the purpose and need of the proposed Projects, it would need to provide 172 MW of electricity into the local grid; and to be sited on previously disturbed land that utilizes existing electrical distribution facilities, ROWs, roads, and other existing infrastructure where feasible to minimize the need for new electrical support facilities. The area required for construction and operation of a 172 MW wind farm would require a much more specific type of geographical location than the Projects to provide adequate wind; a feasible project area of the nature required for wind electricity production is not readily available within the area of analysis for the proposed Projects. For this reason, this alternative is infeasible. **(DEIR at 5-3)**.

SECTION 5.0 FINDINDS REGARDING THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM ("MMRP")

Pursuant to Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code, the Commission, in adopting these Findings, also adopts the MMRP for the Silverado Power West Los Angeles Project. This Program is designed to ensure that, during Project implementation, the County and other responsible parties will comply with the mitigation measures adopted in these Findings.

The Commission hereby finds that the MMRP, which is incorporated herein by reference and attached as Exhibit A to these Findings, meets the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 by providing for the implementation and monitoring of Project conditions intended to mitigate potential environmental effects of the Project.

SECTION 6.0 CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15091 AND 15092 FINDINGS

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the administrative record, the Commission has made one or more of the following findings with respect to each of the significant effects of the Project:

A. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects on the environment.

B. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and such changes have been adopted by such other agency, or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the administrative record, and as conditioned by the foregoing:

A. All significant effects on the environment due to the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible.

SECTION 7.0 CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15084(D)(3) AND 15084(D)(4) FINDINGS

The County has relied on Sections 15084(d)(3) of the State CEQA guidelines, which allow acceptance of working drafts prepared by the Applicant, a consultant retained by the Applicant, or any other person. The County has also relied upon Section 15084(d)(4), which allows the Draft EIR to be prepared directly by, or under contract by the lead agency. The County has reviewed and edited as necessary the submitted drafts to reflect the County's own independent judgment, including reliance on County technical personnel from other departments.

SECTION 8.0 PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21082.1(C) FINDINGS

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(c), the Commission hereby finds that the lead agency has independently reviewed and analyzed the Final EIR, and that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency.

SECTION 9.0 NATURE OF FINDINGS

Any finding made by this Commission shall be deemed made, regardless of where it appears in this document. All of the language included in this document constitutes findings by this Commission, whether or not any particular sentence or clause includes a statement to that effect. This Commission intends that these Findings be considered as an integrated whole and, whether or not any part of these Findings fail to cross reference or incorporate by reference any other part of these findings, that any finding required or committed to be made by this Commission with respect to any particular subject matter of the Final EIR, shall be deemed to be made if it appears in any portion of these Findings.

SECTION 10.0 RELIANCE ON RECORD

Each and all of the findings and determinations contained herein are based on the competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire administrative record relating to the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project. The findings and determinations

constitute the independent findings and determinations of this Commission in all respects, and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.

SECTION 11.0 RELATIONSHIP OF FINDINGS TO EIR

The County finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the EIR or is in the record of proceedings in the matter.

SECTION 12.0 CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS

The custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the County's decision is based is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning located at 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012.

EXHIBIT A
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
("MMRP")

CEQA requires a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for projects where mitigation measures are a condition of project approval and development. The Draft EIR prepared for the Silverado Power West, Los Angeles County Projects identified mitigation measures, where appropriate, to avoid or substantially reduce the environmental impacts associated with the Project. This MMRP is designed to monitor the implementation of those mitigation measures. Accordingly, this MMRP has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15097.

This section lists each of the proposed Project Design Features (PDFs) and required Mitigation Measures (MMs) and identifies the corresponding action required for proof of compliance, the mitigation timing, the party responsible for implementation, and the monitoring agency or party responsible for ensuring each measure is adequately implemented.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Silverado Power West, Los Angeles County Projects
Project Nos. R2011-00833, 00798, 00799, 00807, 00801, 00805
March 2014

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.1 AESTHETICS				
A-1 A Fugitive Dust Control Plan to minimize dust (visual pollution) shall be prepared and implemented.	A. Submit Plan to AVAQMD for review and approval	Prior to any ground disturbance activities	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP AVAQMD
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD
A-2 The Project site shall be maintained free of debris, trash, and waste during construction.	Site inspection	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP
A-3 The Project site shall be visually screened or partially screened during construction by fencing.	A. Submit Site Plans for review and approval	Prior to issuance of applicable building permit	Applicant	LACDRP
	B. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP
A-4 A landscape plan shall be developed for each Project prior to Project construction that shows the detail of a 10-foot wide screening vegetation buffer intended to screen or partially screen the Project visually from area residents or travelers on nearby roadways.	A. Submit landscape plan for review and approval. The landscape plan must be approved prior to grading or building permit.	Prior to 1st grading or building permit whichever comes first for each project.	Applicant	LACDRP/LACFD – support/referral Approval of landscape plan
	B. Implement approved landscape plan	Prior to first energization approval by LADPW B & S	Applicant	LACDRP/LACFD – support/referral Approval of landscape plan
A-5 All lighting shall comply with applicable provisions of the Los Angeles County Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Lights shall be limited to types allowed by the ordinance, installed below maximum allowed heights, pointed downwards and shielded to minimize light trespass, and mounted on	Submit final lighting plan for review and approval	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
essential infrastructure rather than on separate light poles except where poles are required by regulation or by governing agency. Lighting will comply with the hours of operation requirements in the ordinance, and utilize automatic control devices to comply with time limits except where permitted by Los Angeles County. Lighting will be maintained in good repair at all times.				
5.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY				
No mitigation measures are required for Agriculture and Forestry.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.3 AIR QUALITY				
AQ-1 Water active sites at least twice daily (locations where soil disturbance is to occur would be thoroughly watered before earthmoving) during construction.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVQMD
AQ-2 All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of CVC Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-3 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-4 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not be idle more than five minutes in any one hour.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-5 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operation of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-6 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-7 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.	Submit Transportation Demand Management program for review and approval	Prior to issuance of building permits	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPW support and referral for trip reduction determination

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
AQ-8 During array area preparation, mowing shall be used instead of grading and/or disking, and shall be limited to no more than 3.5 acres per day per site to further reduce dust emissions during construction.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-9 All interior roads shall use long-lasting non-toxic chemical soil stabilizers designed for long-term dust stabilization on dirt roads.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-10 Interior array areas shall have re-established pre-existing vegetation or be established with drought tolerant, native, or native compatible vegetation, to the greatest extent feasible, approved by the County biologist and compliant with Fire Department requirements, within two years of energization authorization of an array area by the Department of Public Works, Building and Safety Division, to provide long-term dust stabilization under the arrays.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Biologist	LACFD LACDRP
AQ-11 Earth disturbing activities shall be suspended and/or additional water shall be applied to meet Rule 403 criteria if wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP AVAQMD
AQ-12 Construction activity shall utilize electricity from power poles on or adjacent to the Project sites rather than use of temporary diesel power generators and/or gasoline power generators when electricity with adequate circuit capacity is available from power poles in proximity to construction areas.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-13 In the event temporary night lighting is necessary for construction or maintenance purposes, lighting not requiring the use of diesel or gasoline driven generators shall be used.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
B-1 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a qualified biologist shall be retained by the Applicant as the lead biological monitor subject to the approval of the LACDRP and CDFW. That person shall ensure that impacts to all biological resources are minimized or avoided, and shall conduct (or supervise) pre-grading field surveys for species that may be avoided, affected, or eliminated as a result of grading or any other site preparation activities. The lead biological monitor shall ensure that all surveys are conducted by qualified personnel (e.g. avian biologists for bird surveys, herpetologists for reptile surveys, etc.) and that they possess	A. Retain qualified Biologist(s)	Prior to issuance of Grading Permit	Applicant/Construction Monitor	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Field Surveys	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Maintain daily monitoring reports	During Construction	Applicant/Construction Monitor	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
all necessary permits and memoranda of understanding with the appropriate agencies for the handling of potentially-occurring special-status species. The lead biological monitor shall also ensure that daily monitoring reports (e.g., survey results, protective actions, results of protective actions, adaptive measures, etc.) are prepared, and shall make these monitoring reports available to DRP and CDFW at their request.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-2 Pre-Construction surveys will be conducted prior to ground disturbance at each project site. These surveys will include all special-status species identified as having the potential to be present on the project site; including, but not limited to, badger, kit fox, southern grasshopper mouse, and the species listed below. • Pre-survey information gathering will include reviewing of all available agency nest data and mapping. • A focused pre-construction Swainson's hawk survey shall be conducted to locate any nesting sites within 5 miles of Projects 1 – 6. If Swainson's hawks or their active nests are located within 500 feet of the project sites, all construction-related work shall be postponed and CDFW will be consulted. • Project-related activities likely to have the potential of disturbing suitable bird nesting habitat, which includes ground nesting birds, shall be prohibited from February 1 through August 31, unless a qualified monitoring biologist conducts nesting bird surveys prior to any construction-related disturbance to confirm the absence of active bird nests or bird nesting habitat. Disturbance shall be defined as any activity that physically removes or damages vegetation or habitat or any action that may cause disruption of nesting behavior such as loud noise from equipment or artificial night lighting. Surveys shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. If an active bird nest is discovered, disturbance within 500 feet for raptors shall be postponed until the nest is vacated, offspring are independent of the nest area and there is no evidence of further attempts at nesting. Limits of avoidance shall be marked with high-visibility flagging or fencing. The Applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures and submit the records to LACDRP and CDFW to document compliance with applicable state and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds. • A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted on each site prior to grading. Pre-construction surveys for burrowing owl shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to	Pre-construction surveys for special-status species that have been identified as having potential to occur on site	Prior to grading or as specified per species	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
the commencement of disturbance. The surveys shall follow the protocols set forth by the California Burrowing Owl Consortium (1993 and 2012). If burrowing owls are found during the pre-construction survey, then replacement burrows and habitat must be provided prior to the commencement of construction. The Applicant shall be prepared to provide artificial replacement burrows in the event that owls are detected, either as wintering or breeding individuals. Wintering individuals may be evicted with the use of exclusion devices followed by a period of seven days to ensure that animals have left their burrows. When it can be assured that owls are no longer using the burrows, the burrows can be hand excavated and collapsed under the supervision of the avian biologist. Breeding owls must not be disturbed and must be allowed to complete the raising of young until the fledglings can forage independently of adults and it can be confirmed that further attempts at nesting shall not be undertaken. When this has been confirmed, the owls can be evicted as described above for wintering animals. • Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for special-status ground-dwelling reptiles, including but not limited to coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard. Surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground 4 to 6 weeks in advance of the survey effort, checking weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles or other species determined important by the qualified biological monitor (i.e., biologist must be appropriately permitted for collection and relocation activities) occurring within the work area prior to the start of work shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.				
B-3 During grading, earthmoving activities, and other construction activities the biological monitor shall be present to inspect and enforce all mitigation requirements and to relocate any species that may come into harm's way to an appropriate offsite location of similar habitat. The biological monitor shall be authorized to stop specific grading or	Biological Monitoring	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
construction activities if violations of mitigation measures or any local, state, or federal laws are suspected. The biological monitor shall file a report of the monitoring activities with LACDRP and CDFW. If ongoing biological monitoring of construction activities reveals the presence of any special-status reptiles within an active work area, then work shall be temporarily halted until the animals can be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones. Work areas shall be surveyed for special-status reptile species, such as the coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard, during construction activities. During the construction, surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground in appropriate work areas and checking them weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles occurring within the work area shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-4 Mitigation lands shall be acquired for Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, special-status migratory and wintering birds, and alkali mariposa lily. <u>Swainson's hawk</u>: Impacts due to development of the projects shall be mitigated by the acquisition of good quality Swainson's hawk habitat targeted within the Antelope Valley. Land shall be purchased or placed in a conservation easement or other suitable deed restriction and managed to maintain suitable habitat in perpetuity. The proposed development is not expected to result in the "take" of Swainson's hawk; however, the Applicant shall be required to consult CDFW in the event of take, which may result in additional mitigation prescribed by CDFW. Although the Projects are not expected to result in "take" of Swainson's hawk, mitigation will still be required to alleviate the effects of cumulative impacts on raptor, migratory bird, and burrowing owl habitats: Replacement land will be provided based on the quality of the mitigation land relative to the impacted habitat. The ratio of such replacement shall be determined as follows: • A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 3 acres of development if the replacement land is superior nesting and foraging habitat contiguous to occupied nesting and foraging habitat, and is within a designated or proposed Significant Ecological Area (SEA). • A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 2 acres of development if the replacement land is unoccupied irrigated land, contiguous to occupied habitat and providing superior quality foraging habitat with trees or other such nesting habitat; • A ratio of 1 acre of replacement land for each acre of development if the replacement land provides similar foraging and nesting habitat. <u>Burrowing Owl</u>: Mitigation for any occupied burrowing owl burrows found during pre-construction surveys will include a comprehensive tiered approach: • Pre-construction and construction monitoring surveys conducted by a qualified biologist to detect potential new owl activity onsite;	A. Acquire mitigation lands for Swainson's Hawk	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Acquire mitigation lands for Burrowing Owl	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Pre-construction survey for Alkali Mariposa Lilies	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	D. If necessary Acquire Alkali Mariposa Mitigation land	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
• Disturbance avoidance of occupied burrows during nesting period February 1 – August 31; • Impact avoidance of occupied burrows; • Burrow exclusion and closure and offsite relocation (>100 m), as described previously in in B-2, will be conducted for unavoidable impacts to occupied burrows (after consultation with CDFW). • Minimizing impacts by protecting in-place any owls, their burrows, and their immediate habitat by establishing setback zones and visual screens for burrows adjacent to construction activity; by placing visible markers, and by conducting construction worker awareness training. Setback widths will be applied as appropriate to the level of existing disturbance and owl stage of activity (e.g., for low to moderate construction-related disturbance activity outside the nesting season near burrows in currently high-traffic or disturbance areas, it is assumed owls are adapted to human disturbance and will not need a large setback). • Mitigating unavoidable impacts to habitat: restore temporary impacts to pre-existing conditions; replace nesting/occupied and satellite burrows lost with the same number of suitable burrows on the mitigation site. Mitigation acreage for foraging habitat provided for Swainson's hawk will be sufficient to replace lost burrowing owl habitat because the hawk's replacement habitat will be in-kind or better (i.e., the Project habitat is low quality overall and mitigation habitat will be at least the same quality as the lost habitat OR will have higher quality habitat features overall, such as increased vegetative structure, higher numbers of prey species, less disturbance, and less potential for predation by domestic animals, etc.). Specific habitat considerations as provided in the CDFW 2012 burrowing owl guidance will be considered in selecting the overall habitat replacement acres for the project. <u>Alkali Mariposa Lily</u>: Alkali mariposa lily will be avoided to the greatest extent possible. If pre-construction surveys reveal individuals that cannot be avoided, mitigation of lost alkali mariposa lily shall be provided at a minimum 1:1 ratio. This acreage will be calculated with input from LACDRP and CDFW. Additionally, because alkali mariposa Lilies have locally available seed sources, plantings of the lilies on				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
appropriate soil types on Projects shall be implemented in selected areas. The lilies may also be transplanted from areas planned for disturbance to more suitable locations in the Project area. Transplantation locations must be situated within adequately buffered areas to be found suitable. For all species the mitigation acreage may be located within the Project sites, but outside of the area of development, subject to LACDRP and CDFW approval, if acreage of sufficient quantity and quality exists.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-5 Review and Approval of Habitat Management Lands Prior to Acquisition: The Applicant shall provide a mitigation land acquisition proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for their approval before acquiring the property. The proposal shall discuss the suitability of the property by comparing it to the selection criteria. As a part of the preparation of the land acquisition proposal, acreage quantification by habitat category will be developed with LACDRP and CDFW based on the following criteria: <u>Habitat Management Land Selection Criteria</u>: The Applicant must identify the region within which lands shall be acquired, and the type and quality of habitat to be acquired. Detailed criteria and acreage for each habitat category will be developed with Los Angeles County and CDFW. Foraging habitat shall be assessed as moderate to good with a capacity to improve in quality and value to Swainson's hawks, and must be within the Antelope Valley Swainson's hawk breeding range. Foraging habitat with suitable nest trees is preferred. <u>Habitat Management Lands Acquisition</u>: Prior to initiating ground-disturbing activities, the Applicant shall provide a proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for off-site mitigation land to be restored, enhanced, or maintained according to the requirements of the biological mitigation measures in this EIR. The proposal will require that mitigation lands identified shall be preserved as open space in perpetuity. Within 45 days of acquiring the mitigation land(s), the Applicant shall record a permanent deed restriction on the mitigation land(s) to be preserved as open space. The deed restriction or conservation easement language shall be submitted to LACDRP and CDFW for review and approval prior to recordation. Alternatively, should a conservation easement on the mitigation land be offered, the permanent conservation easement shall be recorded to the satisfaction of LACDRP and CDFW. The Applicant shall establish a fund sufficient for the restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation land(s) until such time when the mitigation land(s) become self-sustaining and until such time as the mitigation land(s) meet the requirements of this mitigation measure. The fund shall be established within 90 days of mitigation land(s)	A. Obtain approval of habitat management lands	Prior to Acquisition	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Record a permanent deed restriction or conservation easement on mitigation land(s)	Within 45 days of acquiring land(s)	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Establish fund in the amount acceptable to LACDRP and CDFW for restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation lands	Within 90-days of mitigation land(s) acquisition	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
acquisition in an amount acceptable to the LACDRP and CDFW.				
Land Acquisition Schedule and Financial Assurances: The Applicant shall complete acquisition, or execute an irrevocable option to purchase, of proposed Habitat Management lands and shall provide financial assurances for dedicating adequate funding for impact avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, if necessary, prior to the issuance of building permits. If an irrevocable option to purchase is utilized, the applicant shall provide a proposed date of purchase which coincides with construction of the facility.				
B-6 Prior to alteration of any streambeds, the Applicant shall enter into an agreement with the CDFW, pursuant to Sections 1601 through 1603 of the State Fish and Game Code.	Enter into an agreement with CDFW pursuant to sections 1601 through 1603	Prior to alteration of Streambed	Applicant	CDFW
B-7 Within all interior portions of the site within and adjacent to the proposed solar arrays, re-vegetation shall be accomplished (excluding interior roads as follows: Vegetation seeded in these areas shall comprise locally-sourced, native species if available, or, native compatible as approved by the County biologist if sufficient locally-sourced native seed stock not available, approximating low-growing communities such as native perennial or annual grasslands (i.e., wildflower fields). Shrub species shall not be used due to these species inability to survive continued vegetation trimming. Vegetation shall be maintained in accordance with Los Angeles County Fire Department regulations.	Revegetation of interior site, excluding interior roads	After construction	Applicant	LACDRP
5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES				
CUL-1 In the event cultural resources are encountered during construction of the Projects, all ground-disturbing activities within the vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall be notified of the find. The archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American Monirot shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to recordation and excavation of the finds and evaluation and processing of the finds in accordance with § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Potentially significant cultural resources	A. Archaeological monitoring and Native American monitor when there is a find	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP NAHC
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Site inspection as needed	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
consist of, but are not limited to, stone, bone, fossils, wood or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resources are determined to be unique historic resources as defined under § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, Mitigation Measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate Mitigation Measures for significant resources could include but not be limited to avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. No further earthwork shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any archaeological artifacts recovered because of mitigation will be donated to a qualified scientific institution approved by the Lead Agency where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.			Archaeologist	
CUL-2 In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, California State Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 dictates that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to CEQA regulations and PRC § 5097.98. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.	A. Archaeological and Native American monitoring	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist/NAHC representative	LACDRP NAHC
	B. Maintain documentation demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-3 Project 4 construction of gen-tie lines shall maintain the right of way buffer zones prescribed by SCE for this historic electric transmission line resource, which is an active transmission line. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-4 Project construction for Project 4 shall maintain a one acre undisturbed area surrounding the Del Sur Cemetery	A. Submit pre-construction surveys	Prior to construction	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
site. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	B. Construction monitoring by qualified Archaeologist	During construction	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Submit construction monitoring documentation	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	D. Site inspection as needed	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-5 A County approved archaeologist will be retained to initiate and supervise cultural resource monitoring during Project related earthwork in areas of the Project that are within 50 feet from certain significant cultural resources, specifically from the defined perimeter of site CA-LAN-1579H (Project 4). If resources are identified, the procedures outlined in CUL-1 will be followed and/or CUL-2 (as necessary). This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	A. Archaeological monitoring	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
PALEO-1: A qualified paleontologist shall be retained by the Applicant prior to excavations reaching 10 feet in depth or greater. A The paleontologist shall develop and execute a Paleontological Resource Mitigation and Monitoring Program and supervise a paleontological monitor whom shall monitor all ground-disturbing activities associated with such excavations. The Program will outline the procedures to follow in regards to paleontological resources (e.g. monitoring protocols, curation, data recovery of fossils, reporting). If fossils are found during such excavation, the paleontological monitor shall be authorized to halt ground-disturbing activities within 25 feet of the find in order to allow evaluation of the find and determination of appropriate treatment according to the Program.	Paleontological Monitoring	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Paleontologist	LACDRP LAC Natural History Museum support/referral
5.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
No mitigation measures are required for Geology and Soils.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS				
GHG-1 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment	A. Submit operating permit(s) as required	Prior to commencement of construction	Applicant	AVAQMD LACDRP
	B. Maintain log	During construction	Applicant/Construction	AVAQMD

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.	demonstrating compliance		Manager	LACDRP
GHG-2 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not be idle more than five minutes in any one hour.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-3 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have proper training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operations of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-4 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 mph or less.	Site inspection as needed	During construction and grading	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-5 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	Prior to Building Permit	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.8 HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS WASTES				
HH-1 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Materials Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.	Submit Hazardous Materials Management Plan	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC
HH-2 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.	Submit Hazardous Waste Management Plan for each Project	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC
HH-3 Prior to the start of construction activities on the parcel containing the historic UST at the location of Project 1, a Phase I ESA will be completed. This mitigation measure only applies to Project 1.	Phase I ESA	Prior to issuance of grading permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP
HH-4 Prior to the start of construction activities, a closure permit for the UST will be verified or obtained from the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Health Hazardous Materials Division. This mitigation measure only applies to Project 1.	Closure permit or verification for UST – Project 1 site	Prior to issuance of grading permit(s)	Applicant	LACFD
HH-5 Construction activities shall be halted if previously unidentified soil contamination is observed or indicated by testing during any earthwork activities. Construction will be halted or redirected until such soil contamination is evaluated and disposed of and/or treated	Testing of soil contamination	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC LACDRP
5.9 HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY				
Construction				
HYDRO-1 Education and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants and Employees. Appropriate educational materials and training for preventing stormwater pollution and additional BMP Fact Sheets from the California Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks can be found at www.cabmphandbooks.com. Practical information material will be provided to employees on general good housekeeping practices. These materials will describe, but are not limited to, spill prevention and control and the use of chemicals, petroleum products, pesticides and fertilizers that should be limited to the property, with no discharge of wastes directly or indirectly to gutters, catch basins or the storm drain system. Information will be distributed directly to the employees as well as being posted in public areas. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities. The required materials shall be	Maintain log demonstrating compliance of Educational materials and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants, and Employee	During Construction	Applicant	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
available at each project site and a log kept to show education has occurred prior to the start of construction.				
HYDRO-2 A spill contingency plan will be prepared by the owner/building operator. As a minimum the Spill Contingency Plan will "mandate the stockpiling of cleanup materials, notification of responsible agencies, disposal of cleanup materials and documentation." This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Submit spill contingency plan	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACDRP
HYDRO-3 No hazardous materials are anticipated to be stored on-site. If deemed otherwise, a designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in accordance with requirements of the Health & Safety Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction and operations	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACFD
HYDRO-4 A designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in compliance of the current requirements of the County of Los Angeles Fire Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Submit all applicable information	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACFD
Operation				
HYDRO-5 Site waste receptacles shall be emptied on a weekly basis or more often if containers approach overflowing. Upon inspection any debris or rubbish will be picked up and the site cleaned. The trash area/room is NOT to be cleaned by hosing down. The type of materials used to clean the area and storage of said materials will be determined by the Contractor. Signage will be posted that lids shall be kept closed at all times. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 at all times during facility operations.	A. Include waste collection and disposal methods in construction contract specifications	During operation	Applicant	LACSD LACDRP
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During operation	Applicant	LACSD LACDRP
5.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING				
No mitigation measures are required for Land Use and Planning	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.11 NOISE				
N-1 Construction operations would not occur between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday, or at any time on Sunday with the exception of limited low-noise	Maintain log of construction equipment arrivals and exit times demonstrating	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
generating potential night work with Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning and Public Works approval.	compliance			
N-2 Construction site and access road maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour shall be established and enforced during the construction period.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-3 Electrically-powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, except for devices like trucks, loaders, dozers, and other heavy equipment.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-4 Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far as practicable, and no closer than 1,000 feet, from noise-sensitive receptors.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
	B. Inclusion of requirement for a Noise Control Plan	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
N-5 The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells are prohibited except where required by OSHA or for safety or emergency warning purposes required by other regulatory agencies.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-6 Project-related public address or music systems used on-site shall not be audible at any adjacent receptor.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
N-7 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 which are in compliance with any applicable legally required equipment noise standards. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors) shall be equipped with shrouds and/or other noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment. Mobile sound barriers with a sound transmission class of 19 or greater will be used for pile driving on Projects where received sound levels at the nearest NSR are predicted to be above the County construction noise limit of 60 dBA during the day.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
	B. Site inspection as needed	During Construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including: **N-8** Siting substations to achieve NEMA sound ratings at sensitive receptors as described in Section 4.11.5.2 not to be closer to the property line of sensitive receptors than the following distances for each individual project: • Project 1 – 325 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 74 dBA • Project 2 – 1,511 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 81 dBA • Project 3 – 650 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 74 dBA • Project 4 (two transformers) – 1,000 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 77 dBA • Project 5 – 748 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 82 dBA	A. Submit acoustical report demonstrating substation design compliance with applicable noise standards	Prior to issuance of relevant building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer
	B. Construct structures in compliance with noise limit requirements of applicable County codes.	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH
	C. Submit post-construction noise measurements verifying compliance upon request	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support/referral
With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including: **N-9** The Applicant shall choose to use NEMA low noise rated transformer equipment which will achieve 10 dBA or greater noise reduction as compared to standard NEMA-rated transformers of a similar size and rated capacity to ensure that Project noise impacts would be less than significant.	A. Submit acoustical report demonstrating substation design compliance with applicable noise standards	Prior to issuance of relevant building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer
	B. Construct structures in compliance with noise limit requirements of applicable County codes.	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH
	C. Submit post-construction noise measurements verifying compliance upon request	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support/referral
5.12 PUBLIC SERVICES				
No mitigation measures are required for Public Services	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.13 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC				
TT-1 Prior to issuance of first grading or building permit, Applicant shall document and submit all required information	Submit Projects' road survey	Prior to issuance of first grading or building	Applicant	LACDPW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
and/or material pertaining to the pavement conditions of construction routes for the Projects, including the formula for calculation of the Projects' fair share of any repair or reconstruction of construction routes to the satisfaction of LACDPW. Applicant shall reimburse the County of Los Angeles for the cost of any repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes attributable to the Projects as agreed to by LACDPW. The timing of any necessary repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes and the required payment by the Applicant shall be determined by LACDPW.		permit		
TT-2 The County, including LACFD Fire Stations 78 (for R2011-00801) and 130 (for R2011-00798, 00799, 00805,00807, & 00833) shall be notified at least three days in advance of any street closures that may affect fire and/or paramedic responses in the area. The Applicant shall provide alternate route (detour) plans to the County, including three sets to LACFD, with a tentative schedule of planned closures, prior to the beginning of construction.	Provide street closure notifications	Three days prior to any street closures impacting fire and/or paramedics	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACFD
TT-3 Stagger construction work shifts before or after peak traffic hours.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support referral Caltrans
	B. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support referral Caltrans
TT-4 Schedule truck deliveries during off peak hours.	Maintain log of truck arrivals and exit times demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
TT-5 Limit water truck deliveries during the AM peak hour to 30 percent of the daily water truck trips.	Maintain log of truck arrivals and exit times demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
TT-6 Encourage carpooling between construction works.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
5.14 UTILITIES				
No mitigation measures are required for Utilities.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
List of Acronyms: B & S – building and safety BMP – Best Management Practice CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act CASQA – California Association of Stormwater Quality Agencies CBC – California Building Code CDFW – California Department of Fish and Wildlife CUP – Conditional Use Permit CVC – California Vehicle Code dBA – decibels (acoustics) DPR – Department of Parks and Recreation ESA – Environmental Site Assessment hp – Horsepower LACDPW – Los Angeles County Department of Public Works LACFD – Los Angeles County Fire Department mph – miles per hour NEMA – National Electrical Manufacturers Association OSHA – Occupational Safety and Health Administration PRC – Public Resources Code ROW – Right of Way SCE – Southern California Edison SWPPP – Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan UFC – Uniform Fire Code UST – Underground Storage Tank WATCH – Work Area Traffic Control Handbook LACDPH – Los Angeles County Department of Public Health LACSD – Los Angeles County Sanitation District				

FINDINGS OF FACT REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

FOR THE SILVERADO POWER WEST LOS ANGELES COUNTY PROJECT

PROJECT SITE NO. 3 (American Solar Greenworks)

COUNTY PROJECT NO. R2011-00799-(5)

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 201100071

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 201100109

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2012061068

PROJECT FINDINGS ORGANIZATION

Section 1	Introduction
Section 2	Findings Regarding Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Have Been Mitigated to a Less than Significant Level
Section 3	Findings Regarding Cumulative Environmental Effects Which are Not Significant or Which Have Been Mitigated to a Less Than Significant Level
Section 4	Findings Regarding Project Alternatives
Section 5	Findings Regarding the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Section 6	CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 and 15092 Findings
Section 7	CEQA Guidelines Section 15084(D)(3) and 15084(D)(4) Findings
Section 8	Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(C) Findings
Section 9	Nature of Findings
Section 10	Reliance on Record
Section 11	Relationship of Findings to EIR
Section 12	Custodian of Records
Exhibit A	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP")

SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The County of Los Angeles ("County") Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") hereby certifies and finds that the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County ("Project") Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR"), State Clearinghouse Number 2012061068, has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq., "CEQA") and the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Cal. Code Regs. Sections 15000 et seq., "CEQA Guidelines").

The Project Final EIR consists of the following documents: (1) December 2013 Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR" or "DEIR"); (2) December 2013 Technical Appendices to the Draft EIR; and (3) March 2014 Final EIR.

The Commission hereby further certifies that it received, reviewed and considered the information contained in the following: (i) the Final EIR; (ii) the application for Conditional Use Permit No. 201100071; and (iii) all hearings, and submissions of testimony from County officials and departments, the Applicant (as defined herein), the public, other public agencies, community groups, and organizations.

Concurrently with the adoption of these findings, the Commission adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP"), attached hereto as Exhibit A. Having received, reviewed and considered the foregoing information, as well as any and all information in the administrative record and the record of proceedings, the Commission hereby makes the following Findings of Fact ("Findings") pursuant to and in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15090:

SECTION 1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

1.1.1 Project Location.

The Project site is located in the northern portion of unincorporated Los Angeles County. The EIR analyzed a total of six (6) individual Project sites (collectively, "Projects" or "Projects 1-6"), which will each be subject to separate review and approval by the County.[1]

These Findings specifically pertain to "Project 3", which is approximately 135.6 acres and located approximately seven miles northwest of downtown Lancaster, located at 70th Street West and West Avenue G. The Assessor's Parcel Numbers ("APNs") for Project 3 are 3268-018-035, 3268-018-002, and 3268-018-036. When complete, Project 3 would produce 35 megawatts ("MW") of electricity from solar photovoltaic modules.

[1] The six individual Projects are not dependent upon each other for success. Each Project can succeed as a stand-alone project if other projects are not approved by Los Angeles County or if technical or financial problems delay or block the completion of a Project. CEQA allows for a group of projects to be analyzed as a single EIR; each Project must also receive approval of its CUP application and other entitlements on the merits of the individual Project and individual site.

1.1.2 Project Description—Features Common to Projects 1 - 6.

There are certain general Project characteristics and features that will apply to each of the individual six Project sites, including Project 3, as follows:

All six of the Projects would be designed and built using the same or similar methods and would have similar Project characteristics. The Projects would utilize photovoltaic ("PV") technology on fixed-tilt or tracker mounting supports. The proposed PV Projects would be constructed in phases and operated for an estimated 35 years. Construction would generally take place during normal daylight hours and would conform to County construction requirements.

Each Project would consist of the following elements:

- PV modules;
- PV module mounting system;
- Balance of system and electrical boxes (e.g., combiner boxes, electrical disconnects);
- Substation (Projects 1 – 5);
- Electrical inverters and transformers;
- Electrical AC collection system, including switchgear;
- Data monitoring equipment;
- Generation tie line; and
- Access roads and chain link perimeter security fencing.

<u>Solar PV Generating Facilities</u>

The Solar Generating Facilities ("SGFs") are designed for optimum performance and ease of maintenance. The Projects would consist of a series of PV module arrays mounted on racking systems, which are typically supported by a pile-driven foundation design. The foundation design would be determined based on the full geotechnical survey. The module mounting system, or racking system, would have a fixed-tilt or tracker PV array configuration and would be oriented south to maximize the amount of incident solar radiation absorbed over the course of the year. Electricity from a series of PV arrays would be funneled and combined at combiner boxes located throughout the SGF. The electrical current would then be further collected and combined prior to feeding the inverters. The SGF would be laid out in a PV block design to allow adequate area for maintenance in the way of clearances or access roads.

Inverters would be consolidated in areas to minimize cable routing and trenching and ensure minimal electrical losses. The alternating current ("AC") from the inverters would be routed through an AC collection system and consolidated within system switchgear. The final output from the SGF would be processed through a transformer to match the interconnection voltage. Electrical safety and protection systems would be provided to meet utility, International Organization for Standardization, and regulatory codes and standards. The energy would be

delivered to the regional electrical distribution network. A security perimeter fence with appropriate signage for public protection would be installed. Points of ingress/egress would be accessed by locked gates for facility services and maintenance.

Photovoltaic Modules

The SGFs would require installation of PV modules. The total number of PV modules required would depend on the technology selected, optimization evaluation, and detailed design. The market conditions, economic considerations, and the environmental factors would be taken into account during the detail design process. The following PV module technologies or equivalent are being considered for incorporation into the Projects:

- PV thin-film technology
- PV crystalline silicon technology
- Fixed-tilt configuration; and
- Tracking design configuration.

The modules configured with a fixed tilt would be oriented toward the south and angled at a degree that would optimize solar resource efficiency. For the tracking configuration, the modules would rotate from east to west over the course of the day. Modules would be non-reflective and highly absorptive.

Standard Installation, Array Assembly, and Racking

The final racking system would be determined by optimization evaluations and economic assessments and incorporated into the detailed design. Likewise, the final foundation design would be determined based on the geotechnical survey for each of the PV Project locations. Once the foundation has been installed, the module mounting system would be installed on it. For a tracking configuration, motors would be installed to drive the tracking mechanism. The PV modules would be delivered to each site during construction to support the installation schedule. The module mounting system would be oriented in rows within a PV design block, presenting a standard and uniform appearance across the facility. The panel configuration would be uniform in height and width.

Collection, Inverters, AC Collection, and Transformers

Modules would be electrically connected into strings. Each string would be funneled by electrical conduit (typically underground) wiring to combiner boxes located throughout the solar field power blocks. The output power cables from the combiner boxes would be again consolidated and feed the direct current ("DC") electricity to inverters, which convert the DC to AC. Underground electrical cables would be installed using ordinary trenching techniques, which include excavation of trenches to accommodate conduits. Wire depth and trench backfill would be in accordance with local, state, and federal codes.

The AC energy would be stepped up to the appropriate interconnection voltage by system transformers to match the voltage at the grid interconnection. As required, switchgear cabinetry

would be provided where necessary for circuit control. All electrical inverters, transformers, and gear would be placed on concrete foundation structures.

Commissioning of equipment would include testing, calibration of equipment, and troubleshooting. All electrical equipment, inverters, collector system, and PV array systems would be tested prior to commencement of commercial operations.

Substations

For Projects 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, which require substations, the area for the substations would be appropriately graded and excavated to accommodate transformer equipment, the control building foundation, and oil containment area. Foundations for equipment within each approximately 1-acre substation would be constructed with reinforced concrete.

Structural components in the Project substation area would include:

- Transformers, switchgear, and safety systems; and
- Footings and oil containment system for transformers.

Interconnection Descriptions

Each inverter would be fully enclosed and pad mounted and would be approximately 90 inches in height. The AC output of two inverters would be fed via underground cable into the low-voltage side of the inverter step-up transformer, generally within 20 feet of the inverters. Each transformer would be mounted on a concrete pad and enclosed together with switchgear and a junction box. Transformers are typically 87 inches in height. The high-voltage output of the transformer would be combined in series via underground collector cables to the junction box of the nearest transformer, ranging from as little as 60 feet to as much as 700 feet. The collector system cables would be tied throughout the SGF at underground junction boxes to the main underground collector cables, which would be composed of a larger wire gauge, to the location of the generator step-up transformer ("GSU"), as applicable at each Project location. The main collector cables would rise into the low-voltage busbar and protection equipment that would be enclosed together with the GSU. The primary switchgear includes the main circuit breaker and utility metering equipment, and it would be enclosed separately but pad-mounted together with the GSU. Both the GSU and the primary switchgear would stand approximately 87 inches in height.

The output of the switchgear would be the start of the Project generation tie ("gen-tie") line. The connections from the SGFs to the regional transmission lines are made through the construction of gen-tie lines. Los Angeles County requires that all gen-tie lines be underground except when other applicable regulations require otherwise, and Projects 1 − 6 are each designed in this manner. Each gen-tie line would consist of three phases of either underground or overhead conductor and a disconnect switch. The overhead conductor would be mounted on either wooden or tubular steel poles of varying heights ranging from 55 to 85 feet. Pole height would be determined by the span between poles as defined in the final design for each Project.

Data Collection Systems

Each Project would be designed with a comprehensive Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition ("SCADA") system for remote monitoring of facility operation and/or remote control of critical components. Within the site, the fiber optic or other cabling required for the monitoring system, would be installed with the gathering line system throughout the solar field leading to a centrally located (or series of appropriately located) SCADA system cabinets. The external telecommunications connections to the SCADA system cabinets may be through either wireless or hard-wired telecommunications to a centralized data collection center.

The system would also include a permanent meteorological data collection system. The station would have several weather sensors: a pyranometer for measuring solar irradiance, a thermometer to measure air temperature, a barometric pressure sensor, and two wind sensors to measure speed and direction. These sensors would be connected to a data logger, which would compile the data for transmission to the data collection center.

Construction

Construction for each of the six Project facilities consists of three major phases: (1) site preparation, (2) PV system installation testing and startup, and (3) site cleanup/restoration. Best Management Practices ("BMPs") would be required during all construction phases of the Projects. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP") incorporating BMPs for erosion control would be prepared and approved before the start of construction. The Projects would also comply with applicable post-construction water quality standards adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board ("RWQCB").

PV System Installation

PV system installation includes earthwork, grading, and erosion control, as well as construction of the plant substation and erection of the PV modules, supports, and associated electrical equipment. System installation would begin with teams installing the steel/concrete piers support structures. The exact design would be finalized pending evaluation of soil conditions.

The proposed method of installation would be the use of vibration-driven pile foundations. This step would be followed by panel installation and electrical work. A very limited volume of concrete would be required for the substation footings, foundations, pads for the transformers, and other substation equipment. Silverado Power, LLC ("Applicant") does not propose to use excavated and poured footings or foundations for the PV arrays. Concrete would be produced at an off-site location by a local provider and transported to the Project sites by truck.

The enclosures housing the inverters have a pre-cast concrete base. Final concrete specifications would be determined during detailed design engineering consistent with applicable building codes. The primary site preparation method for the PV modules would be mowing, because the majority of the six sites are very flat with little change in topography. However, there may be a few instances where limited earthwork, including ponding area leveling of less than one foot in depth, and erosion control cultivation may be required to accommodate the placement of PV arrays. Other than required grading for roads, pads, and drainage features, and standard

trenching and installation work, no other earthwork would be performed within the array areas. Erosion control techniques used during construction may include the use of silt fencing, straw bales, temporary catch basins, inlet filters, and truck tire muck shakers. Construction of the PV arrays includes the installation of support beams, module rail assemblies, PV modules, inverters, transformers, and buried electrical cables.

Wastes generated during construction may include the following: cardboard, wood pallets, copper wire, scrap steel, common trash, and wood wire spools. The Applicant does not expect to generate hazardous waste during construction. However, field equipment used during construction would contain various hazardous materials such as hydraulic oil, diesel fuel, grease, lubricants, solvents, adhesives, paints, and other petroleum-based products contained in construction vehicles.

Operations & Maintenance

Upon commissioning, the Projects would enter the operational phase. For the duration of the operational phase, the Projects would be operated and monitored remotely by a third party contractor, with an assumed two on-site visits for security, maintenance, and system monitoring per quarter (total of eight trips per year) by two third party employees in one light duty truck, and two on-site visits by four third party employees for biannual panel washing that includes one light duty truck and one water truck. Therefore the trips would be no more than 10 trips annually for security, maintenance, system monitoring and panel washing. There would be no personnel stationed on-site full time during operations. The PV arrays would produce electricity passively with minimal moving parts; therefore, maintenance requirements would be limited. Any required planned maintenance would be scheduled to avoid peak-load periods, and unplanned maintenance would typically be responded to as needed depending on the event.

Security

To ensure the safety of the public and the facilities, the sites would be fenced and signs would be posted. Security measures would be installed as necessary to mitigate and/or deter unauthorized access. Access to the sites would be controlled and gates would be installed at the roads entering the property.

Decommissioning Plan

A Decommissioning Plan for each of the Projects would be prepared and submitted for approval to Los Angeles County prior to obtaining a grading permit. The plan would assure that the land is protected during operations and returned as closely as possible to its original state upon termination of the use of the land as a SGF. It is unknown at this time if solar energy electricity production would continue to be utilized on this land in excess of 35 years, and thus the future long-term use of the site beyond 35 years is unknown. The life of each facility is presently proposed to be 35 years. The Decommissioning Plan would be implemented in the early summer of the year or year following the time of facility closure thus allowing the site reclamation to be completed outside of the rainy season and before winter begins. In the event that a Project ceases

operations prior to completion of the 35-year estimated life of the Project, applicable provisions of the Decommissioning Plan would commence.

Section 1.1.3 Project Description—Features Unique to Project Site 3

Project 3 (American Solar Greenworks) would have a generating capacity of 35 MW-AC and would be located on 135.6 acres of unproductive agricultural land in unincorporated northern Los Angeles County. Project 3 would operate year-round, producing electric power during daytime hours.

The power generated by Project 3 would be connected to the existing SCE 66 kV transmission line with the voltage transformation equipment and system safety equipment constructed on the site. Project 3 would interconnect from the Project 3 substation in the northeast corner of the Project site, due north to the existing 66 kV transmission line that runs east-west on the south side of the road, near the intersection of West Avenue G and 70th Street West.

Project 3 Telecommunications Lines

The primary telecommunication method for Project 3 is expected to be direct fiber optic cables placed overhead or underground along the path of the gen-tie line within the public ROW or located on private land, extending from the Project 3 site to existing or proposed telecommunication infrastructure. A dedicated broadband connection from a local provider will be secured at the site.

Project 3 Construction

Project 3 site preparation and construction is expected to begin in the second quarter of 2014 and will last approximately seven months. Project 3 is expected to be commercially operational by the fourth quarter of 2014. The on-site workforce would consist of laborers, electricians, supervisory personnel, support personnel, and construction management personnel. Construction would generally occur during daylight hours, Monday through Friday. Construction activities would be conducted consistent with Los Angeles County regulations regarding hours of construction. Project 3 is expected to create 130 new jobs at peak crew size during the construction phase.

The expected construction water use for Project 3 is 82 acre feet, which would be trucked to this site from a private provider of out of Basin or other authorized water. Construction water needs would be limited to soil conditioning and dust suppression. Potable water would be brought to the Project 3 site for drinking and domestic needs.

Project 3 Operations

No personnel would be stationed at the facility, and no occupied structures would be built on the site. Full and part-time positions over the life of the Project would be required for periodic operation and maintenance activities, and would be performed by a third-party contractor. Operational water requirements for Project 3 would be 5.1 acre feet per year ("AFY").

Section 1.1.4 Discretionary Actions Required for Project 3

Implementation of Project 3 will require the following discretionary approval action by the County:

- **Conditional Use Permit ("CUP")**: To authorize the construction and operation of a solar photovoltaic electricity generating plant on 136 acres and installation of a water tank in the A-2-2 Zone. The project meets the definition of "electric generating plant" in the Los Angeles County Zoning Code. Pursuant to Section 22.24.150, electric generating plants are a use subject to a conditional use permit in the A-2 Zone.

Section 1.1.5 Statement of Project Objectives

Together, proposed Projects 1 – 6 would meet the existing and future demand for electricity generated from clean, renewable technology by generating 172 MW of electrical energy from the sun. Recent legislation enacted in California recognizes the multiple benefits associated with the development of renewable energy resources. These benefits include a reduced reliance on fossil fuel, diversification of energy portfolios, reductions in greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions, and the creation of "green" jobs within the state of California. Additionally, the Projects would assist California in meeting the newly established Renewable Energy Portfolio Standards ("RPS"). Senate Bill 14 established RPS targets for California, stating: "All retail sellers of electricity shall serve 33 percent of their load with renewable energy by 2020." State government agencies have been directed to take all appropriate actions to implement this target in all regulatory proceedings, including siting, permitting, and procurement for renewable energy power plants and transmission lines.

Each of the six proposed PV Project sites, including Project 3, qualify as eligible renewable energy resources as defined by the California Public Resources Code, and would help the State meet the objective of increasing renewable energy generation. In addition, Projects 1-6 would contribute much-needed competitive energy during peak power periods to the electrical grid in California.

As another key objective, Projects 1-6 have each been sited to minimize impacts to the environment and the local community as follows:

- Using disturbed land or land that has been previously degraded from prior use;
- Using existing electrical distribution facilities, rights-of-way, roads, and other existing infrastructure where feasible to minimize the need for new electrical support facilities; and
- Minimizing impacts to threatened or endangered species or their habitats, wetlands and waters of the United States, cultural resources, and sensitive land uses.

SECTION 1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT PROCESS

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, the County completed an Initial Study (June 13, 2012) for the proposed Project, and determined that an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") was required. A Notice of Preparation ("NOP"), including the Initial Study was circulated to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, responsible, trustee, and interested agencies, and key interest groups beginning June 20, 2012 to solicit comments on the proposed content of the Draft EIR. The NOP was circulated for the required 30-day comment period which ended July 20, 2012. A Scoping Meeting was held on July 14, 2012 at the Lancaster Library located at 601 West Lancaster Boulevard in Lancaster, California, to facilitate public review and comment on the Project.

The Draft EIR includes the Initial Study, the comment letters received during the public review period in response to the NOP, and a transcript of verbal comments received during the Scoping Meeting (see Draft EIR Appendix A-1 to A-5). All NOP comments relating to the EIR were reviewed and the issues raised in those comments were addressed, to the extent feasible, in the Draft EIR.

Potentially significant environmental impacts addressed in the Draft EIR include Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Public Services, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. The Draft EIR analyzed both Project-level and cumulative effects of the Project on these topics and identified a variety of mitigation measures to minimize, reduce, avoid, or compensate for the potential adverse effects of the proposed Project.

The Draft EIR also analyzed five potential alternatives to the proposed Project, including: 1) No Project Alternative; 2) Lower Intensity Projects; 3) Select Other Project Sites; 4) Rooftop Solar Generation; and 5) Wind Energy Generation. Potential environmental impacts of each of these alternatives were discussed at the CEQA-prescribed level of detail and comparisons were made to the proposed Project.

The Initial Study determined that the Project would result in less than significant or no impact to several environmental resource areas:

1) **Mineral Resources**: The Project would not have the potential to result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region, including those identified in a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

2) **Employment, Population & Housing**: The Project would provide significant short-term employment for construction workers during the two year construction period. The duration of construction for the Projects would be less than two years; and construction personnel would commute to the Projects from Lancaster, the Los Angeles areas, and Kern County. However, jobs would be temporary and would be for the two year construction period. Construction workers would not establish new households and are not anticipated to permanently relocate to the area. Additionally, adequate construction

personnel presently living in Los Angeles and Kern County would fill all of the jobs that will be available. Area population, housing demands and the need for educational facilities and libraries would not be affected significantly because jobs that would be created are short term in nature; therefore, they would not be impacted by the Projects. Employment, Population, and Housing would not be impacted because the Projects do not require a significant number of personnel to operate them once they are built and producing electricity, and they do not have growth inducing impacts to the local community. Requirements for operations and maintenance are not significant and would be conducted by a few specialized contracted third-party personnel who will cover the Projects. There is no operations and maintenance building on any of the Projects 1-6.

3) **Recreation**: The Project would have no impact on recreation opportunities in the area. There are adequate recreation opportunities in the area, and the availability of these would not change as a result of the Project.

Following the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("LACDRP") internal departmental review and analysis of the proposed Project through the screencheck process, the Draft EIR was submitted to the State Clearinghouse, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, and circulated for public review period beginning January 6, 2014. The 45-day public review period required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15087 ended on February 19, 2014.
A public hearing was held before the County's Hearing Examiner to take public testimony on the Draft EIR, at Lancaster Library located at 601 West Lancaster Boulevard in Lancaster, California, held at 1:00 p.m. on February 1, 2014. Approximately 80 people attended the Hearing Examiner meeting, and 26 attendees provided oral comments on the Draft EIR. A transcript of the oral comments made at the Hearing Examiner Meeting is contained in Section 2.0 of the Final EIR.

SECTION 1.3 PROJECT FINDINGS INTRODUCTION

The Findings made by the County, pursuant to Section 21081 of CEQA, and Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, on the consideration of Project 3 of the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project in unincorporated Los Angeles County, California are presented below. All potentially significant impacts of the Project identified in the Final EIR are included herein, and are organized according to the resources affected.

The Findings in this document are for Project 3 of the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project, and are supported by information and analysis from the Final EIR and other evidence in the administrative record.

For each significant impact, a Finding has been made as to one or more of the following, in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091:

A. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects on the environment.

B. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.

A narrative of supporting facts follows the appropriate Finding. For all of the impacts, one or more of the findings above have been made. The proposed Project will not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts.

SECTION 2.0 FINDINGS REGARDING POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH ARE NOT SIGNIFICANT OR WHICH HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

All Final EIR mitigation measures, as set forth in the MMRP (attached as Exhibit A to these findings) have been incorporated by reference into the conditions of approval for Project 3. These mitigation measures and conditions of approval will result in a substantial mitigation of the effects of Project 3, such that the effects are not significant or have been mitigated to a level of less than significant. Specifically, the Commission has determined, based on the Final EIR, that Project 3 design features, mitigation measures, and conditions of approval will reduce Project impacts concerning Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Public Services, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems to a level of less than significant.

2.1 AESTHETICS

Potential Effect:

Project 3 would have significant visual impacts to the Project area if it had a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; would be visible from, or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail; substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features; or create a new source of substantial light or glare which will adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 3 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Aesthetics.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The Project 3 site is not located along or in proximity to a state scenic highway. The proposed SGFs would not substantially damage or impact scenic resources such as trees (including Joshua

trees) or rock outcroppings, and there are no historic buildings located on the Project 3 site. **(DEIR at 4.1-105)**. The Project 3 site is located in the west/central portion of the Antelope Valley on disturbed, vacant land that consists of fallow agricultural fields with predominantly non-native vegetation. **(DEIR at 4.1-27)**. The existing site is vacant land in a rural area, and is typical of the surrounding landscape. The visual quality of the Project 3 site is low. The site itself does not have unique or rare features, or hold special significance. The topography is uniform and flat. Vegetation is uniform and consists of grasses and short shrubs. No permanent water features occur on the site, and there are no features or characteristics that set the site apart from the surrounding desert landscape. **(DEIR at 4.1-107)**.

Rural development and public infrastructure in the landscape around the site includes farms, rural residences, agricultural fields, high-voltage power lines, electrical distribution lines, and roadways. Development near the Project 3 site is mostly rural in nature. There are several rural ranch residences located directly adjacent to, or within 1 mile of the Project 3 site. Several of the ranch residences have trees planted around them that would provide some degree of vegetative screening from the SGF. The Project 3 site would not be visible from Apollo Regional Park, which is surrounded by trees. The Project 3 site is located approximately 3.2 miles northeast of the Antelope Substation, an approximately 90-acre substation located at West Avenue J and 95th Street West. The Antelope Substation is a major substation, and several high-voltage transmission lines and electric distribution lines connected to the Antelope Substation are located in the area. Existing PV solar fields are located less than five miles south of the Project 3 site. **(DEIR at 4.1-28)**.

There are no designated scenic highways in the vicinity of the Project 3 site. The City of Lancaster's MEA (City of Lancaster 2009a) identifies 90th Street West, located approximately 1.5 miles west of the site, as a potential scenic route, but this roadway has no official designation as a scenic route at this time. No existing riding or hiking trails were identified on or within 5 miles of the Project 3 site. **(DEIR at 4.1-39)**.

The proposed Project 3 SGF components would be located approximately 1.5 miles east of 90th Street West. Construction activities are not likely to be noticeable from 90th Street West due to distance. Because construction activities would be limited to daylight hours, impacts from nighttime lighting would not occur. Lighting will comply with the Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance, and impacts would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure A-5. Any visible dust produced during construction would be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of the fugitive dust plan (Mitigation Measure A-1). Any trash, debris, and waste would be removed from the Project 3 site during construction and the site would be screened or partially screened by fencing, as required by Mitigation Measures A-2 and A-3. **(DEIR at 4.1-95)**.

Because of the low height of the solar modules, no significant shadows would be cast upon nearby sensitive land uses. The SGF would not create a significant source of light. Light sources associated with the SGF would be minimal, and would be restricted to that required for nighttime safety and security according to County requirements and would comply with all requirements of the Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Only permitted types of lights would be used and specified height limits employed. Lighting would be installed and

directed downward and shielded to avoid light trespass. The amount of light generated by the security lights would be consistent with the provisions of the new Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance, and would allow less light trespass than existing sources of light produced by man-made structures adjacent to the proposed site, including residences, roadway lights, and other existing nearby facilities. Motion sensors and time limits would be employed per the lighting ordinance. Project 3 equipment and components would introduce minimal amounts of glare to the existing landscape. The PV modules are designed to absorb sunlight, and the glass modules that protect the PV surface are typically formulated to allow sunlight to pass with minimal reflection. Impacts from new sources of light or glare will be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure A-5. **(DEIR at 4.1-113)**.

The completed SGF would not be dominant in motorists' views unless directly adjacent to the site. **(DEIR at 4.1-95)**. After Project 3 is completed, viewers such as nearby residents and travelers on nearby roads would still experience views of the open desert lands around the site. Even where visible, the SGF components would not be a dominant element in the landscape unless the viewer was situated directly adjacent to the facility. **(DEIR at 4.1-107)**.

A visual simulation was developed from less than 0.1 mile south of the Project 3 site boundary along 70th Street West **(DEIR Figure 4.1-34)**. From this distance, the Project 3 SGF would be visible, but would not dominate the view due to the low profile of the solar panels. From a 1.5 mile distance, the SGF would be much less noticeable, and would largely fade into the flat landscape. Adverse visual effects from construction would be temporary and would last only during the construction time period, and would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures A-1, A-2, and A-3. **(DEIR at 4.1-96)**. The overall contrast of the proposed SGF was rated as "weak" from this viewpoint. Although vegetation would be removed under the solar panels, this change would not be visible. The solar panels would form a horizontal line on the landscape that mimics the flat lines of the landscape, and therefore creates only a weak contrast from this perspective. Because of the low profile of the solar panels, views of the Tehachapi Mountains would not be blocked. The grey color and smooth texture of the solar panels already exists in the landscape, creating a weak contrast. Because the contrast introduced to the landscape from less than 0.1 mile away is considered weak, it is reasonable to assume that the solar facility would largely fade into the flat landscape and not dominate the view from viewpoints further than approximately 0.25 miles away from the Project 3 site. **(DEIR at 4.1-108)**.

Even though the SGF components are out-of-character with the directly adjacent land (which is primarily rural residential), the SGF is not out-of-character when considering the context of the surrounding landscape. Rural developments and public infrastructure are common in the landscape around the Project 3 site and include rural residences, an airport, agricultural fields, residential developments, and electrical infrastructure such as PV solar fields, electric distribution lines and high-voltage transmission lines. The Project 3 site is located less than three miles from other PV solar fields similar in appearance and size. Because other structures are common in the vicinity of the site and in the larger area, and because the site itself is not characterized by high visual quality, the visual impact of the SGF on the existing visual character of the Project 3 site and its surroundings would be less than significant. As shown by the simulation in DEIR Figure 4.1-34, the SGF would not dominate the landscape from most

viewpoints unless the viewer is located directly adjacent to the proposed SGF. Because of the low profile of the solar panels, the SGF would largely fade into the flat landscape. **(DEIR at 4.1-108)**.

After construction, it is highly unlikely that the Project 3 SGF would be discernible from Little Buttes, Quartz Hill, the Foothills Area, or the California Poppy Reserve, all of which are located over five miles from the site. Even from a superior viewing position at these locations, a viewer is not likely to be able to distinguish the SGF from over 5 miles away from the site. If it was visible, at such a distance the constructed SGF would not appear dissimilar to an agricultural field in shape and size. Project 3 would be dominant in the view from the Class III bikeway located along 70th Street West and the Class II bike lane along West Avenue G. Accordingly, a 10-foot vegetative buffer is proposed along 70th Street West, West Avenue G, and the north and east-facing Project site boundaries closest to West Avenue G, to mitigate the views from the bikeway (Mitigation Measure A-4). **(DEIR at 4.1-96)**. Overall, Project 3 would have a less than significant aesthetic impact with mitigation.

Project 3's visual impacts are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

A-1 A Fugitive Dust Control Plan to minimize dust (visual pollution) shall be prepared and implemented.

A-2 The Project site shall be maintained free of debris, trash, and waste during construction.

A-3 The Project site shall be visually screened or partially screened during construction by fencing.

A-4 A landscape plan shall be developed for each Project prior to Project construction that shows the detail of a 10-foot wide screening vegetation buffer intended to screen or partially screen the Project visually from area residents or travelers on nearby roadways.

A-5 All lighting shall comply with applicable provisions of the Los Angeles County Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Lights shall be limited to types allowed by the ordinance, installed below maximum allowed heights, pointed downwards and shielded to minimize light trespass, and mounted on essential infrastructure rather than on separate light poles except where poles are required by regulation or by governing agency. Lighting will comply with the hours of operation requirements in the ordinance, and utilize automatic control devices to comply with time limits except where permitted by Los Angeles County. Lighting will be maintained in good repair at all times.

2.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 3 would have a significant impact on Agriculture and Forestry Resources if it would: convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-

agricultural use; conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract; conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)); result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or 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.

Finding:

Project 3 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Agriculture and Forestry Resources. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

As currently mapped under 2010 data from the Department of Conservation ("DOC") Farmland Monitoring and Mapping Program ("FMMP"), the Project 3 site contains no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. **(DEIR at 4.2-5)**. Project 3 also contains no forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. **(DEIR at 4.2-8)**.

Project 3 is located within the Los Angeles County Zoning Ordinance designation A-2, Heavy Agriculture. According to LACDRP, a solar electricity energy generating facility is allowed in Zone A-2 with the issuance of a CUP (Chapter 22.24.150[A]). Furthermore, Project 3 will not preclude future agricultural uses. Project 3 and its associated gen-tie lines are located within a LACDRP Agricultural Opportunity Area ("AOA"). The Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan Policy states that these areas should be protected from incompatible uses. The Antelope Valley Area Plan states that applications for non-agricultural uses in the AOA areas will be evaluated for their impact upon adjacent agricultural operations.

Project 3 would involve conversion of land that was formerly used for agricultural production to renewable electricity energy production. Construction and operation of Project 3 would not involve other restrictions, obstructions, or resources that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. The Project 3 site has not been irrigated since 1972. The Project would produce power in a passive manner and would result in minimal air pollutant emissions, traffic, and noise, and would not affect adjacent agricultural operations.

Project 3 and its associated gen-tie lines are located in an AOA, but are not currently utilized for agricultural purposes. Additionally, the proposed properties are not designated under a Williamson Act contract. As a result, construction and operation of Project 3 would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, impacts to existing agricultural use zoning, designated AOAs, and Williamson Act contracts will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-7)**.

Project 3 and its associated gen-tie lines will temporarily preclude future agricultural use at the Project 3 site. Following the termination of power generating activities at the Project 3 site, all facilities and equipment would be removed and the land would be restored as near to its pre-development condition as possible in the event a new similar land use is not contemplated at that time by then current owners. A decommissioning and reclamation plan detailing land restoration activities will be provided, as required by Los Angeles County as part of the CUP. Additionally, the Applicant will be required to provide a decommissioning bond, or other suitable financial guarantee acceptable to the County, equal to the amount of money estimated to be required to decommission the Project, including any additional environmental review which might become necessary, and restore the land to as near its pre-development condition as possible. Project 3 will not impact any land use outside the development site's limits. Impacts regarding the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-9)**.

2.3 AIR QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Project 3 would have a significant impact on Air Quality if it would: conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; cumulatively produce a considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors); expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 3 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Air Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Pursuant to the Clean Air Act ("CAA"), the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District ("AVAQMD") is required to reduce project emissions of criteria pollutants for which the Mojave Desert Air Basin ("MDAB") is in non-attainment. Project 3 is located within a non-attainment area, which means that certain Project-related activities could potentially be subject to emission control strategies contained within the AVAQMD Federal 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan. Construction would involve activities that can result in emissions of particulate matter ("PM"). However, construction of PV panels and the generation-tie line would not require intense earthmoving activities, only the low-impact method of mowing the surface. Compliance with applicable rules, ordinances, plans, and policies would minimize PM emissions during construction. Project 3 construction emissions would not exceed emission thresholds, and would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-25)**. Since construction of Projects 1-6 would occur consecutively over the course of two years, construction of the six Projects could overlap, which may cause a peak in the Projects' daily construction emissions. However, maximum daily and

annual construction emissions would not exceed the appropriate AVAQMD significant thresholds for all pollutants, even with the potential overlap in construction schedules. **(DEIR at 4.3-37)**.

During operation of Project 3, the Project site would undergo maintenance and security activities no more than 10 times annually (as needed), and would not create a daily increase in population or visitors. The assumption of 10 annual trips includes truck trips associated with panel washing. Project 3 would comply with AVAQMD rules and Los Angeles County ordinances, and is designed to be consistent with applicable county policies and the Attainment Plan. Therefore, Project 3 would not conflict with implementing the applicable air quality plan. **(DEIR at 4.3-25)**. Project 3 emissions estimates are based on compliance with AVAQMD Rule 403 requirements for fugitive dust suppression, watering exposed surfaces two times daily. The short-term emissions during Project 3 construction would not exceed AVAQMD significance thresholds. As such, Project 3 would not exceed thresholds, result in violating air quality standards, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. **(DEIR at 4.3-28)**. Likewise, even when all six Projects operate concurrently, the operation of all six Projects would not exceed annual thresholds, violate air quality standards, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. **(DEIR at 4.3-42)**.

Decommissioning of Project 3 (and each of the six Project sites) would require removal of the PV modules, PV module mounting system, electrical boxes, electrical inverters and transformers, electrical AC collection system, switchgear, data monitoring equipment, chain link perimeter security fencing, concrete ballasts, underground vaults, other concrete pads, and transporting all components off site. Air quality emissions from decommissioning would be generated from the pieces of equipment used and any fugitive dust from site preparation activities. Equipment used for decommissioning and removal of concrete ballasts, underground vaults, concrete pads, etc. generally would be similar to that used for construction, except that no mowing or clearing would be required.

Since decommissioning does not involve mowing or clearing activities, the level of fugitive dust emissions would be less than emissions created during construction. After removal of equipment and facilities, the site would need to be re-vegetated. Decommissioning would occur after at least 25 years of operation; therefore, equipment engine technology is likely to be more advanced, and fuels to be cleaner. Criteria pollutant emissions during decommissioning would be equal to or, more likely, less than those estimated from construction for Project 3, and will also be less than significant with mitigation. **(DEIR at 4.3-42)**. Similar to criteria pollutant emissions, hazardous air pollutant emissions during decommissioning would be less than during construction due to advanced equipment engine technology and cleaner fuel and would therefore be less than significant. Exhaust from off-road equipment and on-road vehicles used during decommissioning and construction truck trips would not be expected to create objectionable odors, and would therefore be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-42).**

The MDAB is currently nonattainment for federal and state ozone standards and nonattainment for state PM_{10} standards, which may cause emissions from Project 3 to contribute to an existing or projected air quality standard exceedance. Implementing any of the six Projects (including Project 3) would increase short-term emissions related to construction, and a negligible increase in long-term emissions related to SGF operation and maintenance. Construction for all six sites is

expected to be staggered, and may extend over two years. Nevertheless, due to the nature and size of each site, simultaneous construction would not result in emissions of ozone precursors or PM_{10} that exceed daily thresholds. As shown in DEIR Table 4.3-12, "Mitigated Peak Daily Concurrent Construction Emissions", and DEIR Table 4.3-13, "Peak Annual Concurrent Construction Emissions", the impacts would be less than significant prior to mitigation. Implementing control strategies to reduce PM_{10} further minimizes air emissions. As such, construction of Project 3 would not 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). **(DEIR at 4.3-43)**.

During the operation phase, Project 3 will have no major emissions sources. Facility operating equipment that emits regulated air pollutants or requires AVAQMD permits is not planned at Project 3 or any of the six Project sites. As shown in DEIR Table 4.3-20, "Peak Annual Concurrent Operation Emissions", the impacts would be less than significant. As such, operation of Project 3 would not 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). **(DEIR at 4.3-43)**.

Project 3 was analyzed for air impacts to nearby sensitive receptors; however, sensitive receptors would only be exposed during construction activities. PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations are expected to occur primarily from fugitive dust emissions during mowing, excavation activities and, to a lesser degree, during PV installation and paving. Rule 401 requires that airborne particles remain on the site from which they originate under normal wind conditions. Proper mitigation techniques must be implemented to ensure that fugitive dust is contained. Emissions are not expected to expose even the closest sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and, due to the distance between Project sites, simultaneous construction at two sites would not significantly impact the same sensitive receptors. **(DEIR at 4.3-44)**.

Operational emissions from Project 3 would not impact local air pollutant levels at nearby receptors. As mentioned above, sensitive receptors would only be exposed, if at all, during construction activities. The primary source of Project emissions during operation is the vehicles used by facility maintenance staff traveling to and from the site. Maintenance is expected to occur no more than 10 times per year. Overall, Project 3 would not result in an increase in VMT over the course of one summer or winter day. Thus, Project 3 would not result in new long-term stationary sources, nor would they result in a significant number of net new vehicular trips. Carbon monoxide (CO) impacts from operation of Project 3 to sensitive receptors would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-44)**.

Short-term concentration levels during the construction phase will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, including those resulting in a cancer risk greater than the EPA screening levels. **(DEIR at 4.3-45)**. Due to continuous construction of each of the six Project sites over the course of two years (which may overlap), long-term cancer impacts from construction activities to the nearest sensitive receptors were evaluated, and found that even with the cumulative contribution of health risk impacts from all six proposed Projects, the cumulative cancer risk to the identified sensitive receptors is still below the cancer risk exposure level.

(DEIR at 4.3-46). Short-term concentration levels during Project 3 site construction will neither expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, nor exceed the cancer risk screening levels. **(DEIR at 4.3-47)**.

Project 3's Air Quality impacts are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

AQ-1 Water active sites at least twice daily (locations where soil disturbance is to occur would be thoroughly watered before earthmoving) during construction, or, in locations where water alone does not suffice to suppress dust adequately apply nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers, according to manufacturers' specifications. Temporarily stockpiled soil shall be secured with tarps or plastic sheeting or sprayed with non-toxic soil stabilizers.

AQ-2 All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).

AQ-3 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.

AQ-4 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not idle more than five minutes in any one hour.

AQ-5 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operation of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.

AQ-6 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.

AQ-7 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.

AQ-8 During array area preparation, mowing shall be used instead of grading and/or disking, and shall be limited to no more than 3.5 acres per day per site to further reduce dust emissions during construction.

AQ-9 All interior roads shall use long-lasting non-toxic chemical soil stabilizers designed for long-term dust stabilization on dirt roads.

AQ-10 Interior array areas shall have re-established pre-existing vegetation or be established with drought tolerant, native, or native compatible vegetation approved by the County biologist and compliant with Fire Department requirements, within two years of energization authorization of an array area by the Department of Public Works, Building and Safety Division, to provide long-term dust stabilization under the arrays.

AQ-11 Earth disturbing activities shall be suspended and/or additional water shall be applied to meet Rule 403 criteria if wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour.

AQ-12 Construction activity shall utilize electricity from power poles on or adjacent to the Project sites rather than use of temporary diesel power generators and/or gasoline power generators when electricity with adequate circuit capacity is available from power poles in proximity to construction areas.

AQ-13 In the event temporary night lighting is necessary for construction or maintenance purposes, lighting not requiring the use of diesel or gasoline driven generators shall be used.

2.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 3 would have a significant impact on biological resources if it would: 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 Wildlife ("CDFW") or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ("USFWS"); have a substantial adverse effect on sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations of CDFW or USFWS; have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including marshes, vernal pools, and coastal wetlands) or waters of the United States, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; 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; convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, southern California black walnut, etc.); conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas ("SEAs") (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Section 22.56.215), and the Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas ("SERAs"), (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Section 22.44, Part 6); or conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 3 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Biological Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 3 does not contain riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, wetlands, Joshua trees, or yucca trees on the site, and does not contain non-jurisdictional or state regulated waters. **(DEIR at 4.4-59)**. There are also no wetlands, vernal pools, or riparian habitat identified on the Project 3 site. No federally protected wetlands (including marshes, vernal pools, and coastal wetlands) or waters of the United States, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act features, were identified on the Project 3 site. The site slopes from an elevation of 2,394 feet on the north side to an elevation of 2,379, dropping only 15 feet across the site. Thus, drainages do not occur on the site. There are some small and limited depressions or swales on the site, but they do not support riparian or wetland vegetation of any kind. The habitat in the swales is not substantially different than the surrounding land. Based on site observations, the man-made irrigation ditches along the north and east boundaries and through the middle of Project 3 do not support riparian vegetation or riparian habitats, and impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.4-60)**.

Project 3 does not contain oak trees, juniper trees, Joshua trees, or other unique native trees. **(DEIR at 4.4-62)**. Project 3 and the immediate vicinity do not contain or conflict with any Significant Ecological Areas ("SEAs"), Wildflower Reserve Areas, or Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas ("SERAs"). The closest SEAs to Project 3 are Fairmont and Antelope Buttes which are located 5.4 miles west, and Rosamond Lake which is 9 miles east. Therefore, Project 3 would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. **(DEIR at 4.4-63)**. There are no adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plans in effect within the boundaries of the Project 3 site. **(DEIR at 4.4-64)**.

Project 3 has low potential has low potential for alkali mariposa lily, merlin, northern California legless lizard, loggerhead shrike, mountain plover, and Swainson's hawk to occur onsite. There is moderate potential for American badger. There is low potential for burrowing owl to occur on site, as no individuals or potential burrows were observed during 2013 targeted surveys. There is high potential for ferruginous hawk to occur onsite. Developing the site as a solar generating facility would remove habitat for these species, and the 135.6 acres of land for Project 3 would be mostly unavailable as wildlife habitat during the life of Project 3, which would result in a significant impact. However, mitigation measures will reduce this impact to less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.4-57; 4.4-58)**.

Project 3 is located within an area of topographically homogeneous open space, and there are no local constraints to movement of resident or migratory wildlife that development of Project 3 would further aggravate. There are no known wildlife migration pathways that would be impacted by Project 3. **(DEIR 4.4-61)**.

Wildlife nursery areas on the Project 3 site may include nesting sites of native bird species, which are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-712; Ch. 128; July 13, 1918; 40 Stat. 755) and the California Fish and Game Code Section 3503. Burrowing owls may have suitable burrows on the Project 3 site, and protections for bird nesting and burrowing owls are provided in Mitigation Measures B-1, B-2, B-3 and B-4. The intent of acquiring mitigation lands would be to select available parcels that would replace lost breeding/foraging/winter foraging habitat and enhance the overall quality of habitat for a variety of species including migratory bird species. The potential to acquire parcels that would also maintain or enhance wildlife migration corridors in the area would also be considered. Planting of shrubs and native vegetation on the Project 3 site would improve the opportunities for shrub-nesting bird species on the Project 3 site when it is complete. **(DEIR 4.4-61)**.

Project 3 impacts to Biological Resources are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

B-1: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a qualified biologist shall be retained by the Applicant as the lead biological monitor subject to the approval of the LACDRP and CDFW. That person shall ensure that impacts to all biological resources are minimized or avoided, and shall conduct (or supervise) pre-grading field surveys for species that may be avoided, affected, or eliminated as a result of grading or any other site preparation activities. The lead biological monitor shall ensure that all surveys are conducted by qualified personnel (e.g. avian biologists for bird surveys, herpetologists for reptile surveys, etc.) and that they possess all necessary permits and memoranda of understanding with the appropriate agencies for the handling of potentially-occurring special-status species. The lead biological monitor shall also ensure that daily monitoring reports (e.g., survey results, protective actions, results of protective actions, adaptive measures, etc.) are prepared, and shall make these monitoring reports available to LACDRP and CDFW at their request.

B-2: Pre-Construction surveys will be conducted prior to ground disturbance at each project site. These surveys will include all special-status species identified as having the potential to be present on the project site; including, but not limited to, badger, kit fox, southern grasshopper mouse, and the species listed below.

Pre-survey information gathering will include review of all available agency nest data and mapping.

- A focused pre-construction Swainson's hawk survey shall be conducted to locate any nesting sites within 5 miles of Projects 1 – 6. If Swainson's hawks or their active nests are located within 500 feet of the project sites, all construction-related work shall be postponed and CDFW will be consulted.

- Project-related activities likely to have the potential of disturbing suitable bird nesting habitat, which includes ground nesting birds, shall be prohibited from February 1 through August 31, unless a qualified monitoring biologist conducts nesting bird surveys prior to any construction-related disturbance to confirm the absence of active bird nests or bird

nesting habitat. Disturbance shall be defined as any activity that physically removes or damages vegetation or habitat or any action that may cause disruption of nesting behavior such as loud noise from equipment or artificial night lighting. Surveys shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. If an active bird nest is discovered, disturbance within 500 feet for raptors shall be postponed until the nest is vacated, offspring are independent of the nest area and there is no evidence of further attempts at nesting. Limits of avoidance shall be marked with high-visibility flagging or fencing. The Applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures and submit the records to LACDRP and CDFW to document compliance with applicable state and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds.

- A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted on each site prior to grading. Pre-construction surveys for burrowing owl shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. The surveys shall follow the protocols set forth by the California Burrowing Owl Consortium (1993 and 2012).

  If burrowing owls are found during the pre-construction survey, then replacement burrows and habitat must be provided prior to the commencement of construction. The Applicant shall be prepared to provide artificial replacement burrows in the event that owls are detected, either as wintering or breeding individuals.

  Wintering individuals may be evicted with the use of exclusion devices followed by a period of seven days to ensure that animals have left their burrows. When it can be assured that owls are no longer using the burrows, the burrows can be hand-excavated and collapsed under the supervision of the avian biologist.

  Breeding owls must not be disturbed and must be allowed to complete the raising of young until the fledglings can forage independently of adults and it can be confirmed that further attempts at nesting shall not be undertaken. When this has been confirmed, the owls can be evicted as described above for wintering animals.

- Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for special-status ground-dwelling reptiles, including but not limited to coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard. Surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground 4 to 6 weeks in advance of the survey effort, checking weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles or other species determined important by the qualified biological monitor (i.e., biologist must be appropriately permitted for collection and relocation activities) occurring within the work area prior to the start of work shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.

B-3: During grading, earthmoving activities, and other construction activities the biological monitor shall be present to inspect and enforce all mitigation requirements and to relocate any species that may come into harm's way to an appropriate offsite location of similar habitat. The biological monitor shall be authorized to stop specific grading or

construction activities if violations of mitigation measures or any local, state, or federal laws are suspected. The biological monitor shall file a report of the monitoring activities with LACDRP and CDFW during construction activities, as frequently as required by LACDRP and CDFW. If ongoing biological monitoring of construction activities reveals the presence of any special-status reptiles within an active work area, then work shall be temporarily halted until the animals can be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones. Work areas shall be surveyed for special-status reptile species, such as the coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard, during construction activities. During the construction, surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground in appropriate work areas and checking them weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles occurring within the work area shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.

B-4: Mitigation lands shall be acquired for Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, special-status migratory and wintering birds, and alkali mariposa lily.

Swainson's hawk: Impacts due to development of the projects shall be mitigated by the acquisition of good quality Swainson's hawk habitat targeted within the Antelope Valley. Land shall be purchased or placed in a conservation easement or other suitable deed restriction and managed to maintain suitable habitat in perpetuity.

The proposed development is not expected to result in the "take" of Swainson's hawk; however, the Applicant shall be required to consult CDFW in the event of take, which may result in additional mitigation prescribed by CDFW. Although the Projects are not expected to result in "take" of Swainson's hawk, mitigation will still be required to alleviate the effects of cumulative impacts on raptor, migratory bird, and burrowing owl habitats:

Replacement land will be provided based on the quality of the mitigation land relative to the impacted habitat. The ratio of such replacement shall be determined as follows:

- A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 3 acres of development if the replacement land is superior nesting and foraging habitat contiguous to occupied nesting and foraging habitat, and is within a designated or proposed SEA.

- A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 2 acres of development if the replacement land is unoccupied irrigated land, contiguous to occupied habitat and providing superior quality foraging habitat with trees or other such nesting habitat;

- A ratio of 1 acre of replacement land for each acre of development if the replacement land provides similar foraging and nesting habitat.

Burrowing Owl: Mitigation for any occupied burrowing owl burrows found during preconstruction surveys will include a comprehensive tiered approach:

- Pre-construction and construction monitoring surveys conducted by a qualified biologist to detect potential new owl activity onsite;

- Disturbance avoidance of occupied burrows during nesting period February 1 – August 31;

- Impact avoidance of occupied burrows;

- Burrow exclusion and closure and offsite relocation (>100 m), as described previously in in B-2, will be conducted for unavoidable impacts to occupied burrows (after consultation with CDFW).

- Minimizing impacts by protecting in-place any owls, their burrows, and their immediate habitat by establishing setback zones and visual screens for burrows adjacent to construction activity; by placing visible markers, and by conducting construction worker awareness training. Setback widths will be applied as appropriate to the level of existing disturbance and owl stage of activity (e.g., for low to moderate construction-related disturbance activity outside the nesting season near burrows in currently high-traffic or disturbance areas, it is assumed owls are adapted to human disturbance and will not need a large setback).

- Mitigating unavoidable impacts to habitat: restore temporary impacts to pre-existing conditions; replace nesting/occupied and satellite burrows lost with the same number of suitable burrows on the mitigation site. Mitigation acreage for foraging habitat provided for Swainson's hawk will be sufficient to replace lost burrowing owl habitat because the hawk's replacement habitat will be in-kind or better (i.e., the Project habitat is low quality overall and mitigation habitat will be at least the same quality as the lost habitat OR will have higher quality habitat features overall, such as increased vegetative structure, higher numbers of prey species, less disturbance, and less potential for predation by domestic animals, etc.). Specific habitat considerations as provided in the CDFW 2012 burrowing owl guidance will be considered in selecting the overall habitat replacement acres for the project.

Alkali Mariposa Lily: Alkali mariposa lily will be avoided to the greatest extent possible. If preconstruction surveys reveal individuals that cannot be avoided, mitigation of lost alkali mariposa lily shall be provided at a minimum 1:1 ratio. This acreage will be calculated with input from LACDRP and CDFW. Additionally, because alkali mariposa Lilies have locally available seed sources, plantings of the lilies on appropriate soil types on Projects shall be implemented in selected areas. The lilies may also be transplanted from areas planned for disturbance to more suitable locations in the Project area. Transplantation locations must be situated within adequately buffered areas to be found suitable.

For all species the mitigation acreage may be located within the Project sites, but outside of the area of development, subject to LACDRP and CDFW approval, if acreage of sufficient quantity and quality exists.

B-5: Review and Approval of Habitat Management Lands Prior to Acquisition: The Applicant shall provide a mitigation land acquisition proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for their approval before acquiring the property. The proposal shall discuss the suitability of the property by comparing it to the selection criteria. As a part of the preparation of the land acquisition proposal, acreage quantification by habitat category will be developed with LACDRP and CDFW based on the following criteria:

Habitat Management Land Selection Criteria: The Applicant must identify the region within which lands shall be acquired, and the type and quality of habitat to be acquired.

Detailed criteria and acreage for each habitat category will be developed with Los Angeles County and CDFW. Foraging habitat shall be assessed as moderate to good with a capacity to improve in quality and value to Swainson's hawks, and must be within the Antelope Valley Swainson's hawk breeding range. Foraging habitat with suitable nest trees is preferred.

Habitat Management Lands Acquisition: Prior to initiating ground-disturbing activities, the Applicant shall provide a proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for off-site mitigation land to be restored, enhanced, or maintained according to the requirements of the biological mitigation measures in this EIR. The proposal will require that mitigation lands identified shall be preserved as open space in perpetuity. Within 45 days of acquiring the mitigation land(s), the Applicant shall record a permanent deed restriction on the mitigation land(s) to be preserved as open space. The deed restriction or conservation easement language shall be submitted to LACDRP and CDFW for review and approval prior to recordation. Alternatively, should a conservation easement on the mitigation land be offered, the permanent conservation easement shall be recorded to the satisfaction of LACDRP and CDFW.

The Applicant shall establish a fund sufficient for the restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation land(s) until such time when the mitigation land(s) become self-sustaining and until such time as the mitigation land(s) meet the requirements of this mitigation measure. The fund shall be established within 90 days of mitigation land(s) acquisition in an amount acceptable to the LACDRP and CDFW.

Land Acquisition Schedule and Financial Assurances: The Applicant shall complete acquisition, or execute an irrevocable option to purchase, of proposed Habitat Management lands and shall provide financial assurances for dedicating adequate funding for impact avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, if necessary, prior to the issuance of building permits. If an irrevocable option to purchase is utilized, the Applicant shall provide a proposed date of purchase which coincides with construction of the facility.

B-6: Prior to alteration of any streambeds, the Applicant shall enter into an agreement with the CDFW, pursuant to Sections 1601 through 1603 of the State Fish and Game Code.

B-7: Within all interior portions of the site within and adjacent to the proposed solar arrays, re-vegetation shall be accomplished (excluding interior roads) as follows:

Vegetation seeded in these areas shall comprise locally-sourced, native species if available, or, native compatible as approved by the County biologist if sufficient locally-sourced native seed stock is not available, approximating low-growing communities such as native perennial or annual grasslands (i.e., wildflower fields). Shrub species shall not be used due to these species inability to survive continued vegetation trimming. Vegetation shall be maintained in accordance with Los Angeles County Fire Department regulations.

2.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 3 would have a significant effect on Cultural Resources or Paleontological Resources if it would: cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5; cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 3 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Cultural Resources and Paleontological Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

No historical resources were detected within Project 3 during the transect survey conducted for the EIR. Historic-era structures appear to have once been on the Project 3 site from 1954 to 1974, but all structures were demolished sometime between 1974 and 2005, based on a review of historic and modern aerial photos. Some features and remnants of the demolished farm complex remain dispersed on the parcel, and were recorded on a Department of Parks and Recreation 523 form (CA-LAN-4351H). The integrity of the site has been compromised by the demolition of the structures. Site CA-LAN-4351H lacks any physical integrity and the recordation of surface artifacts has likely exhausted the date potential for the site. Site CA-LAN-4351H is recommended as not eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources ("CRHR") or National Register of Historic Places ("NRHP"), and no further management consideration of the resource is necessary. Therefore, construction, operation and maintenance of Project 3 will not cause any change in the significance of historical resources. **(DEIR at 4.5-24)**.

There is a possibility that historical and/or archaeological materials would be uncovered during necessary subsurface excavations for the construction of the proposed Project 3. Although the likelihood of encountering archaeological resources on the site is considered low, this impact is potentially significant. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, which describes procedures to be followed in the event that cultural resources are discovered, is

required. CUL-1 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-24)**.

No paleontological resources were detected during the transect survey of Project 3. Based on the paleontological assessment conducted for the EIR, it is unlikely that any intact significant paleontological resources are or will be located on the Project 3 site. Therefore, Project 3 would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources. If Project excavations reach 10 feet or more below current grade and reveal that older Quaternary deposits and/or the later Miocene deposits are exposed, there will be a higher potential for encountering significant vertebrate fossil remains. Deep cuts should be inspected by a qualified paleontologist in an attempt to identify the more sensitive older alluvial strata. **(DEIR at 4.5-30)**.

There is a possibility that paleontological materials would be uncovered if excavations for the construction of the proposed Project 3 reach a depth of 10 feet or more below current grade. Although the likelihood of encountering paleontological resources within the Project 3 area is considered low, this impact is potentially significant. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure PALEO-1, the development of a Paleontological Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Plan ("PRMMP") by a qualified paleontologist is required if construction excavation depth is below 10 feet or more below current grade. PALEO-1 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-30)**. Operation of Project 3 would not require any excavations to the depth of potential paleontological resources. There, operation of Project 3 would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources. **(DEIR at 4.5-30)**.

There is no indication as a result of this study that human remains are present within the boundaries of Project 3. The records search and the field survey indicate no evidence of human remains on or near the sites. Project-related earth disturbance, however, has the potential to unearth previously undiscovered remains, resulting in a potentially significant impact. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2 that describes procedures to be followed in the event that human remains are discovered would ensure that impacts are reduced to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-32)**.

Project 3 impacts related to Cultural Resources are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

CUL-1: In the event cultural resources are encountered during construction of the Projects, all ground-disturbing activities within the vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall be notified of the find. The archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to recordation and excavation of the finds and evaluation and processing of the finds in accordance with § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of, but

are not limited to, stone, bone, fossils, wood or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites.

If the resources are determined to be unique historic resources as defined under § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, Mitigation Measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate Mitigation Measures for significant resources could include but not be limited to avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds.

No further earthwork shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any archaeological artifacts recovered because of mitigation will be donated to a qualified scientific institution approved by the Lead Agency where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.

CUL-2: In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, California State Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 dictates that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to CEQA regulations and PRC § 5097.98. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.

PALEO-1: A qualified paleontologist shall be retained by the Applicant prior to excavations reaching 10 feet in depth or greater. The paleontologist shall develop and execute a PRMMP and supervise a paleontological monitor whom shall monitor all ground-disturbing activities associated with such excavations. The Program will outline the procedures to follow in regards to paleontological resources (e.g. monitoring protocols, curation, data recovery of fossils, reporting). If fossils are found during such excavation, the paleontological monitor shall be authorized to halt ground-disturbing activities within 25 feet of the find to allow evaluation of the find and determination of appropriate treatment according to the Program.

2.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Potential Effect:

Project 3 would have a significant effect on Geology and Soils if it would: expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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 active fault trace; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including

the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides; result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; 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; be located on expansive soil; have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater; or conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance or hillside design standards in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element.

Finding:

Project 3 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Geology and Soils. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 3 and the Project 3 gen-tie line are not located in an active or potentially active fault zone according to the California Geological Survey ("CGS") Seismic Hazard Zone Maps (CGS 2008) and Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map (CGS 2010). The closest fault zones are the San Andreas Fault Zone, which is located approximately 7.25 miles to the south southwest of the Project 3 site, and the Garlock Fault Zone, which is located approximately 20 miles northwest of the Project 3 site. Based on research and available information, Project 3 is susceptible to seismicity, but is not susceptible to fault rupture; therefore, impacts involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-14)**.

The United States Geological Survey ("USGS") National Seismic Hazard Map (2008) indicates that Project 3 and the Project 3 gen-tie line are located in an area mapped from 40 to 60 percent gravity for peak horizontal acceleration with a 10 percent probability of exceedance in the next 50 years. According to the USGS, and dependent on structural design, 10 percent gravity is the lower threshold at which damages to structures are likely to occur. Based on geologic and soil conditions at the site, the USGS Ground Motion Parameter Calculator indicates that Project 3 facilities will need to be designed to sustain spectral accelerations of approximately 0.52 to 1.5 percent gravity (USGS 2012). **(DEIR at 4.6-16)**.

Project 3 has the potential to be subjected to ground motion during construction. However, because of the temporary nature of the construction period relative to the frequency of occurrence of significant seismic events, the potential for Project 3 construction to expose people or structures to substantially adverse effects due to seismicity and ground motion will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-16)**. During operation of the facility, all Project 3 structures and operational facilities will be designed in accordance with the California Building Code ("CBC") and applicable industry standards. The design and construction of Project 3 would comply with all applicable building codes and standards established by regulatory agencies, including the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the CBC. Therefore, Project 3 impacts related to seismic shaking and strong ground motion hazards would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-16)**.

The CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) does not identify Project 3 or the Project 3 gen-tie line as being located in zones with the potential for liquefaction or ground failure. Additionally, Project 3 is located on poorly sorted coarse grained materials with groundwater typically greater than 100 feet below ground surface (bgs) (USGS 2008). Based on available geologic information, the potential susceptibility of ground failure is less than significant for Project 3 construction and operation. **(DEIR at 4.6-19)**.

The location of Project 3 and its associated gen-tie lines contain generally low slopes of less than 1 percent gradient. As indicated in the Project description, development of the solar facility would not result in significant changes to existing site grades, and would not increase the susceptibility to slope failure. Additionally, the CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) does not identify Project 3 as being located in zones susceptible to landslides or slope failure. Therefore, the potential susceptibility for slope failure and landslides during construction and operation is less than significant for Project 3. **(DEIR at 4.6-20)**.

The soil series at the location of Project 3 and the Project 3 gen-tie line was indicated to be Hesperia fine sandy loam. This soil series have an erosion factor of 0.28 to 0.32, indicating a low to medium susceptibility to water erosion, and a wind erodibility group of 3, indicating a low to medium susceptibility to wind erosion. Implementation of appropriate erosion and sediment control BMPs will be implemented during construction and operation of Project 3, as outlined in Draft EIR Hydrology Section 4.9 and Air Quality Section 4.3, and will mitigate potential impacts to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.6-21)**.

Based on the information in the Geotechnical Critical Issues Analyses and Custom Soil Resource Reports prepared by Tetra Tech, the location of Project 3 and the Project 3 gen-tie line contains generally low gradient slopes. Development of solar facilities will not result in significant changes to existing site grades, and will not increase the susceptibility to slope failure. Additionally, the CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) indicates that Project 3 is not susceptible to landslide or liquefaction hazards. **(DEIR at 4.6-24)**.

Although subsidence has occurred throughout the Antelope Valley, the majority of subsidence has been concentrated near the City of Lancaster and was caused by excessive groundwater pumping and decreased water levels. Subsidence in the vicinity of Project 3 was between 2 to 3 feet from 1930 to 1992, and there has been no surficial evidence such as fissures and differential settling observed near the Project 3 location. Based on historic rates of subsidence and a relatively stabilizing water level due to reduced pumping and proposed aquifer management, future subsidence is expected to be minimal. In the event that minor future subsidence does occur, the potential impact to the proposed structural design (post mounted racking systems and relatively small foundations for electrical equipment) would be minimal. Based on geologic data and the proposed construction and operation as described in the Project description, Project 3 impacts to on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-24)**.

The soil series at the location of Project 3 and the Project 3 gen-tie line was indicated to be Hesperia fine sandy loam. This soil series is rated for a low shrink/swell potential, and the potential for expansive soils to affect Project 3 is less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-25)**. Project

3 does not propose the use of any sanitary facilities that will require septic tanks or sanitary wastewater disposal during either construction or operation. Therefore, no impact will occur. Project 3 is located on the floor of the Antelope Valley where the terrain is nearly flat. Project 3 is not located in the hillside area, and is not affected by Hillside Management Areas. **(DEIR at 4.6-26)**.

2.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Potential Effect:

Project 3 would have a significant impact related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change if it would: generate direct or indirect GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment, based on any applicable threshold of significance; or conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 3 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 3's short-term GHG emissions during the construction phase (maximum daily emissions of 5,335 pounds per day) would not exceed the AVAQMD significance threshold for maximum daily emissions (548,000 pounds per day). As such, Project 3 would not exceed thresholds or result in violating GHG standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected GHG violation. **(DEIR at 4.7-21)**.

Because construction of the six Project sites may overlap, concurrent construction emissions of Projects 1-6 were analyzed by emissions per year and thus compared to the annual GHG threshold of 100,000 metric tons of CO_{2e} per year, for long-term emissions. The unmitigated peak annual construction levels for all six Project sites are expected to result in annual GHG emissions below the most stringent annual threshold proposed by the AVAQMD (100,000 tons per year). As such, the Project will not exceed thresholds or result in violating GHG standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected GHG violation. **(DEIR at 4.7-23)**.

During operations, Project 3 facility operation would be limited to general maintenance, panel washing, and security. The primary source of emissions during operations is mainly the vehicles used by facility maintenance staff to and from the site. It is anticipated that operations and maintenance would utilize one water truck for panel washing and one light duty truck twice per year. Although Project 3 is scheduled for bi-annual panel washing, a maximum of ten trips were assumed for each Project (four round trips plus one additional round trip to be conservative). The operation emissions provided for each Project are considered the Project's baseline emissions, since it does not include any solar energy reductions. Because operations-related GHG emissions are considered long term, the AVAQMD daily significance threshold of 100,000

metric tons of CO_{2e} per year was used to analyze impacts during operations. The total annual operational emissions for Project 3 are 5.53 tons of CO_{2e} per year, which is well below the AVAQMD threshold of 100,000 tons per year. **(DEIR at 4.7-25)**. Likewise, concurrent operation of all six Projects is estimated to generate approximately 31 metric tons of CO_{2e} annually, which is well below the AVAQMD threshold. **(DEIR at 4.7-27)**.

Construction-related emissions from Project 3 would be temporary and finite in nature, below the applicable thresholds, and are consistent with the AB 32 Scoping Plan. Accordingly, Project 3's construction-related GHG emissions would not be a cumulatively considerable contribution to climate change. Project 3's operational GHG emissions would be negligible and would not comprise a cumulatively considerable contribution to climate change and, therefore, would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.7-28).**

Furthermore, with implementation of Project 3, there would be an added environmental benefit of displacing GHG emissions in the region. The solar energy generation would offset emissions from electricity usage, which would otherwise be produced by fossil-fueled power generation facilities using petroleum, natural gas, or coal combustion. Project 3 would result in a temporary increase in GHG emissions which is below the most stringent proposed threshold; employ active solar technologies supportive of the state's goals to reduce GHG emissions; and is consistent with the County of Los Angeles's goals. **(DEIR at 4.7-29)**.

Project 3 would therefore be in accordance with the state's need for the construction of renewable energy power plants to meet the state's GHG reduction objectives including:

- California's RPS that requires California's investor-owned electric utilities to obtain 20 percent of the electricity that they supply by 2010 from renewable sources;

- Executive Order S-14-08, which established the RPS targets for California that "all retail sellers of electricity shall serve 33 percent of their load with renewable energy by 2020";

- Executive Order S-03-05 on climate change to advance renewable energy and other solutions to reduce California's GHG emissions; and

- The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) that established a comprehensive program of regulatory and market mechanisms to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020.

Project 3 includes various project design features and objectives that address global climate change and reduce GHG emissions, as do each of the Projects 1-6. Project design features include aspects of the Project that either must be incorporated as part of the conditions of approval, or that the Applicant has committed to include to reduce GHG impacts associated with the Project. The Projects would be designed to reduce emissions through specific goals set. The expected Project features would directly or indirectly result in lower emissions of GHGs. The Project design features that address global climate change impacts include the following:

- Vegetation to sequester GHGs
    - Preserve natural areas by mowing, which maintains the organic material in the soil
    - Preserve open space by limiting constructing on portions of Project site
    - Plant trees and shrubs along the edges as buffers to adjacent receptors

- Construction limitations to minimize GHG emissions
    - Limit construction equipment idling beyond regulation requirements
    - Limit number of simultaneous construction projects by phasing

As such, Project 3 would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation to reduce GHG emissions. **(DEIR at 4.7-30)**. In addition to the Project design features listed above, the Project's impacts related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

GHG-1 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.

GHG-2 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not idle more than five minutes in any one hour.

GHG-3 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operations of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.

GHG-4 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.

GHG-5 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.

2.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Potential Effect:

Project 3 would have a significant effect on Hazards and Hazardous Materials if it would: create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the

release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment; emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses; be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; for a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires, due to location within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4); expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, due to location within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires due to location within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires due to location within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard; or constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 3 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 3 would not require extensive or ongoing use of hazardous materials. Hazardous materials used during the construction of Project 3 would be typical of most construction projects of this type. Hazardous materials used during construction activities may include gasoline, diesel fuel, oils, lubricants, solvents, detergents, degreasers, paints, and other supplies. All hazardous materials would be transported, stored, and properly disposed of in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. The accidental release of hazardous materials or wastes during construction activities is possible. The accidental release of hazardous materials or wastes would be promptly contained and abated in accordance with all applicable laws and regulatory requirements, and therefore is not expected to result in a significant impact. **(DEIR at 4.8-11)**. During operation of Project 3, limited quantities of hazardous materials would be stored on-site. These materials would include fire suppressant and transformer insulating oil (mineral oil). The mineral oil would be contained within Project 3 electrical transformers and switches. Project 3 would develop and implement a hazardous materials and hazardous waste management program for both construction and operational phases. The program would include the following, as required by applicable regulations. **(DEIR at 4.8-11)**.

- **Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste Handling:** The construction contractor would prepare a Project-specific hazardous materials management and hazardous waste management program for Project 3. This program would be implemented prior to the start

of construction activities. The program would prescribe proper hazardous material use, storage, and disposal requirements, as well as hazardous waste management procedures. The program would identify specific types of hazardous materials to be used during Project 3 construction and operation, and specific types of wastes that will be generated. All personnel would be provided with Project-specific training. These programs would be developed to ensure that all hazardous materials and hazardous wastes would be handled and disposed of in a safe and environmentally sound manner consistent with all applicable laws and regulations. Employees and contractor personnel handling wastes would receive hazardous materials training and be trained in hazardous waste procedures, spill contingencies, waste minimization procedures and treatment, storage, and disposal facility ("TSDF") training in accordance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration ("OSHA") Hazard Communication Standard and 22 CCR. Prior to the start of construction of Project 3, a Hazardous Materials Business Plan ("HMBP") will be prepared and submitted in accordance with Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code and Title 22 CCR, as required by the Certified Unified Program Agency.

- **Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan:** The construction contractor would prepare a site-specific SWPPP for review and approval by the appropriate regulatory agencies and implement it prior to the start of demolition or construction activities at Project 3. The SWPPP would utilize BMPs to address the storage and handling of hazardous materials and sediment runoff during demolition and construction activities.

- **Transport of Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Wastes:** Hazardous materials transported by truck would include fuel (diesel fuel and gasoline) and oils and lubricants for equipment. Transportation of hazardous waste may include hazardous building materials and small amounts of construction waste such as waste oils, solvents, or cleaners. The construction contractor would prepare written procedures for the transport of hazardous materials and hazardous waste in accordance with the California Vehicle Code, California Highway Patrol Regulations (CCR Title 13); Department of Transportation Regulations, Title 49, CFR; and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regulations, Title 40 CFR, and CCR 22 regulations prior to the start of construction activities at Project 3.

- **Fueling and Maintenance of Construction Equipment:** The construction contractor would prepare written procedures for the fueling and maintenance of construction equipment prior to the start of construction activities at Project 3. Vehicles and equipment would be refueled off-site or on-site by refueling trucks. If on-site refueling or maintenance activities are required, refueling and maintenance procedures would include implementation of BMPs to ensure that chemicals do not come in contact with the ground. Equipment will be inspected daily for potential leakage or failures.

- **Emergency Release Response Procedures:** The construction contractor would prepare an Emergency Release Response Plan ("ERRP") detailing the response to releases of hazardous materials. The ERRP would be prepared prior to the start of construction activities at Project 3. The ERRP would prescribe hazardous materials handling

procedures for reducing the potential for a release during construction activities, and would include an emergency response program to ensure the rapid and safe cleanup of any accidental spills. All hazardous material spills of threatened release would be immediately reported. All construction and operations personnel would be aware of federal, state, and local emergency response reporting guidelines. Implementation of the aforementioned hazardous materials and hazardous waste management programs would reduce the potential impacts associated with the handling, transport, and use of hazardous materials during both construction and operation of Project 3 to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.8-12)**.

If lead based paint is found during construction of Project 3, the Applicant would comply with County requirements and provide a copy of the qualifications/license of the lead based paint abatement contractor that will perform the abatement or removal of lead based paint to the Department of Public Works Building and Safety Division and the County of Los Angeles Fire Department Health and Hazardous Materials Division. If required by the County, the Applicant would prepare and submit a Hazardous Building Materials Demolition Assessment and Management Plan to the Department of Public Works and Fire Department for review and approval to ensure compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local laws, and regulations. OSHA regulations are in place to assure that these materials are safely removed prior to or during demolition and renovation activities. In compliance with regulations requiring removals by firms and individuals licensed to do such work pursuant to applicable regulations the Project's potential impacts regarding lead exposure would be less than significant. Implementation of the aforementioned ERRP would reduce the potential impacts associated with upset and accidental release conditions at Project 3 (and gen-tie lines) to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.8-13)**.

Project 3 would convert sunlight directly into electrical energy without the creation of hazardous emissions, and no impact to sensitive land uses would occur as a result of hazardous emissions. The primary emissions created by Project 3 (and gen-tie lines) would be air emissions from vehicle and equipment exhaust generated during construction activities. Potential impacts due to air emissions created during construction and maintenance activities at Project 3 would be less than significant, as discussed in Section 4.3 of the DEIR. **(DEIR at 4.8-13)**.

Based on the Environmental Data Review ("EDR"), the location of Project 3 and the Project 3 gen-tie line is not located at a known site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites complied pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5; however, RECs indicated to be in the vicinity of Project 3 include an underground storage tank ("UST"). No known releases have occurred at Project 3 or adjacent to Project 3. Based on the information compiled in the EDR, Project 3 would have no impact due to site hazards to the public and environment during construction or operations. **(DEIR at 4.8-14)**.

Based upon a review of the *General William J. Fox Airfield Land Use Compatibility Plan*, Project 3 and the Project 3 gen-tie line are located within the General William J. Fox Airfield land use plan. Project 3 is located in General William J. Fox Airfield's Zone C: Extended Approach/Departure Zone. Generally, there is no concern with regard to any object up to 50 feet tall within Zone C. The Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission ("ALUC") has

stated that review of Project 3 is not required. Therefore, Project 3 impacts to public airports or public use airports would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.8-15)**. Project 3 is not otherwise located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. **(DEIR at 4.8-16)**.

Emergency response and evacuation procedures for Project 3 would be coordinated by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department ("LACSD") and the Los Angeles County Fire Department ("LACFD"). During Project 3 construction activities, the LACSD and LACFD require that adequate vehicular access be provided and maintained. The Traffic Control Plan for Project 3 would provide for the required access of emergency vehicles during construction activities. During operation of Project 3, Project operation staff would work with both the LACSD and the LACFD to ensure adequate emergency procedures are in place. The HMBP would include an Emergency Response Plan. Additionally, an Emergency Action Plan and a Fire Prevention Plan would be prepared for Project 3 as required by Cal/OSHA. These plans would ensure that Project 3 would have established plans and procedures for responding to emergency situations, and would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, Project 3 impacts to emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans would be less than significant during both construction and operations. **(DEIR at 4.8-17)**.

Project 3 is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. No impact would occur in this regard. **(DEIR at 4.8-17)**. A public water system for fire control does not exist near Project 3. The facility design includes a dedicated 10,000-gallon fire water storage tank to be installed and maintained at Project 3, in compliance with LACFD Regulation 19 and other applicable Fire Department water tank specifications. Because the SGF design includes a dedicated fire water tank meeting Fire Department requirements, the water and pressure would meet fire flow needs. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.8-18)**.

Project 3 is surrounded by rural agricultural lands with no industrial uses, manufacturing uses, or other particularly high fire hazard uses in the vicinity. Project 3 would comply with all applicable Fire Code and County and City ordinance requirements, and fire safety standards, as stated in DEIR Section 4.12 Public Safety. A Fire Management Plan, which would be prepared for Project 3, establishes standards and practices that would minimize the risk of fire and, in the event of fire, provide for immediate suppression and notification. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(DEIR at 4.8-18)**.

Project 3 will convert sunlight into electrical energy through a process which would not constitute a fire hazard. All materials and equipment used in the construction of each facility would be specified based on applicable codes and building regulations. Welding activities may also potentially result in the combustion of brush and vegetation. A Fire Protection and Prevention Plan would reduce these potential impacts to less than significant. A Fire Prevention Plan would be prepared for Project 3 as required by Cal/OSHA, and Project 3 would include a dedicated 10,000- gallon fire water storage tank in compliance with LACFD Regulation 19. Therefore, Project 3 does not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard, and would have a less than significant impact on fire hazards in the area. **(DEIR at 4.8-19)**.

Project 3 impacts related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

HH-1 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Materials Management and Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.

HH-2 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.

HH-5 Construction activities shall be halted if previously unidentified soil contamination is observed or indicated by testing during any earthwork activities. Construction will be halted or redirected until such soil contamination is evaluated and disposed of and/or treated.

2.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Project 3 would have a potentially significant impact on Hydrology and Water Quality if it would: violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; 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; substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; 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; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality; conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52); result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance; use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course); otherwise substantially degrade water quality; 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, or within a floodway or floodplain; place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain; 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; or place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 3 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

A Notice of Intent form would be submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board ("SWRCB") to apply for coverage under the NPDES General Permit for construction of Project 3. During construction, Project 3 would implement BMPs as specified in the site-specific SWPPP. The SWPPP would be developed by a State of California certified Qualified SWPPP Developer ("QSD") and during construction monitored by a State of California certified Qualified SWPPP Practitioner ("QSP"). The SWPPP would be approved by the County and uploaded to the State via the State SMARTs system prior to Project 3 ground-breaking. The SWPPP would identify construction-phase BMPs to be implemented. With implementation of the BMPs, Project 3 and its associated gen-tie lines would only have the potential to generate less than significant effects on groundwater and/or stormwater runoff, and will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during construction. **(DEIR at 4.9-34; 4.9-38)**.

During Project 3 operations, mechanical equipment on the solar farm would either be made of pollutant free materials or fitted with special containment units to house any possible drips or spills of lubricants, oils, or other chemicals. Maintenance activities, including solar array washing, would be performed with clean water and allowed to evaporate or drip to the ground. Maintenance and operations personnel would be required to maintain all necessary spill prevention, control, and countermeasures on hand during site visits. These spill response kits would include, but are not limited to, personal protective equipment, spill pads, absorbents, booms, shovels, garbage bags, plastic sheeting, and disposal drums. Permanent treatment BMPs would include infiltration basins to preserve water quality. With these spill prevention, control, and countermeasures on-site, there would be a less than significant impact on groundwater and stormwater runoff quality, and Project 3 will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during operation. **(DEIR at 4.9-34; 4.9-38).**

As stated in Section 4.14.5 of the DEIR, water would be required for dust control measures during the duration of construction efforts. An analysis of the water supply, including the use of well water, is presented in DEIR Section 4.14 Utilities and Service Systems. At the outset of construction, water would be supplied via truck to meet the demands of Project 3. Well water is not considered available at this time, and would be reevaluated upon a change in status. The demands of Project 3 are anticipated to have a less than significant impact on the region's groundwater supplies. Furthermore, construction activities are not anticipated to interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. As stated in Section 4.14.5 of the DEIR, water may be required in the first few years of operation to establish the mature vegetation planted after construction. Similar to the construction period, water would be supplied via truck to Project 3. The volume of water required would be considerably less than the water required for construction activities. Well water would be considered if its availability changes. As with construction, impacts to the region's groundwater supplies are anticipated to be less than significant with operation of Project 3. Also, the effect on groundwater recharge by the

development's increase in impervious surface will be mitigated by the proposed infiltration basins. These infiltration basins will allow the increase in runoff volume from the proposed development (up to the 25-year storm event) to infiltrate on-site and recharge the groundwater basin. Therefore, less than significant impacts to groundwater recharge are anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-35)**.

During construction of Project 3 and its associated gen-tie lines, soils would be disturbed through activities such as minor grading and vegetation removal, which could lead to issues with soil erosion and siltation on- and off-site. Through the implementation of construction control measures per California Association of Stormwater Quality Agencies ("CASQA") standards (silt fencing, fiber rolls, and sandbag barriers), Project 3 would have less than significant impacts on erosion and debris deposition during construction (CASQA 2003). Project 3 and its associated gen-tie lines would require minor grading on-site which would not drastically change the existing drainage patterns or natural channels. Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan ("SUSMP")/Low Impact Development ("LID") Reports would help account for the increase in runoff erosion capabilities resulting from the developments' increase in impervious surfaces. The infiltration basins would help reduce flow velocities and the sediment load of the runoff, which would lower the erosion and siltation capabilities of the runoff. Therefore, Project 3 would result in less than significant impacts to erosion and siltation on- and off-site. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Project 3 and its associated gen-tie lines would require minor grading on-site, which would not drastically change the existing drainage patterns or natural channels. The increase in runoff flow rates and volumes from the developments' increase in impervious surfaces would be addressed by Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7. The infiltration basins, created by elevated road sections, would capture the increase in runoff volume (up to the 25-year storm event) and allow it to infiltrate on-site. The remaining runoff would flow over the road section and return to pre-development flow conditions before leaving the project site. With this measure, less than significant impacts would occur related to flooding on- and off-site. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7 would address the increase in runoff flow rates and volumes from the developments' increase in impervious surfaces. The infiltration basins, created by elevated road sections, would capture the increase in runoff volume (up to the 25-year storm event) and allow it to infiltrate on-site. The remaining runoff would flow over the road section and return to predevelopment flow conditions before leaving the Project site. The basins would be placed within the first half of the site to allow flows over the roads sections enough time to normalize before leaving Project 3. Project soils would treat the captured runoff at the infiltration basins. Therefore, less than significant impacts to existing or planned stormwater drainage systems are anticipated. Also, significant impacts to polluted runoff are not anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Project 3 and its associated gen-tie lines would incorporate Los Angeles County LID standards, while following the requirements of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works ("LACDPW"). Existing on-site drainage patterns and channels would not be significantly altered by the Projects' minimal grading, and all off-site drainage patterns and channels would not be significantly impacted either. Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage

Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7 would allow the developments' increase in runoff (up to the 25-year storm event) to be both infiltrated and treated on-site. This also minimizes downstream impacts by returning to predevelopment flow conditions. Therefore, Project 3 will not conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance. **(DEIR at 4.9-38)**.

Project 3 and its associated gen-tie lines are not in the vicinity of any SWRCB-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated. During construction, wastewater treatment systems would not be necessary. The Projects would contract services to supply and maintain portable toilets. Therefore, the impacts of Project 3 to the quality of groundwater and surface water would be less than significant during construction. The same portable toilet services would be contracted for operations. Temporary portable toilet services would be delivered during the required maintenance periods on an as needed basis. As a result, there would be less than significant impacts to the water quality of groundwater and surface water during Project 3 operations. **(DEIR at 4.9-39)**.

Project 3 does not involve the construction of housing. Therefore, no housing will be placed within a 100-year flood hazard area, and no impacts are anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-39)**.

Project 3 is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain, or within the immediate vicinity of any levees or dams which would place people or structures at risk of significant loss, injury or death in the event of a failure. In the event of a failure of the aqueduct near Project 3, the distance between the site and the aqueduct would allow the flow to dissipate. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated. Project 3 has slopes that very mild, at less than two percent. Therefore, high mudflow conditions are not anticipated. Accordingly, Project 3 will not place structures in an area subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow. **(DEIR at 4.9-40)**.

Project 3 impacts related to Hydrology and Water Quality are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

HYDRO-1 Education and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants and Employees. Appropriate educational materials and training for preventing stormwater pollution and additional BMP Fact Sheets from the California Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks can be found at www.cabmphandbooks.com. Practical information material will be provided to employees on general good housekeeping practices. These materials will describe, but are not limited to, spill prevention and control and the use of chemicals, petroleum products, pesticides and fertilizers that should be limited to the property, with no discharge of wastes directly or indirectly to gutters, catch basins or the storm drain system. Information will be distributed directly to the employees as well as being posted in public areas. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities. The required materials shall be available at each project site and a log kept to show education has occurred prior to the start of construction.

HYDRO-2 A spill contingency plan will be prepared by the owner/building operator. As a minimum the Spill Contingency Plan will "mandate the stockpiling of cleanup materials, notification of responsible agencies, disposal of cleanup materials and documentation." This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-3 No hazardous materials are anticipated to be stored on-site. If hazardous materials are required to be stored on-site, a designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in accordance with requirements of the Health & Safety Code and store the materials according to applicable regulations. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-4 A designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in compliance with the current requirements of the County of Los Angeles Fire Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-5 Site waste receptacles shall be emptied on a weekly basis or more often to prevent containers from overflowing. Upon inspection any debris or rubbish will be picked up and the site cleaned. The trash area is NOT to be cleaned by hosing down. The type of materials used to clean the area and storage of said materials will be determined by the Contractor. Signage will be posted that lids shall be kept closed at all times. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 at all times during facility operations.

2.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Potential Effect:

Project 3 would have a significant effect related to Land Use and Planning if it would: physically divide an established community; be inconsistent with applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to, the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans; be inconsistent with the zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject properties; or conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria.

Finding:

Project 3 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Land Use and Planning. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 3 is located within a sparsely populated area, and is not located within any established community. The closest established community is Antelope Acres, which is located

approximately 1.4 miles north of Project 3. Project 3 is located in an area that has been characterized by agricultural uses for several decades, and has been in transition to residential uses or vacant land. Project 3 would not physically alter the community, would not divide any community, or change any public access routes to them. Impacts would be considered to be less than significant. Likewise, Project 3's proposed gen-tie lines would not result in physical improvements that would result in dividing an established community, and the proposed gen-tie line would be located within a public right-of-way or an easement on private land. Therefore, Project 3 would not divide an established community, and impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.10-36)**.

Project 3 is not located within the boundaries of a Community Standards District; therefore, no district development standards apply to Project 3. The Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan designates the Project 3 site as N-1, Non-Urban use. According to the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, allowable uses in the N-1 designation include utility installations (County of Los Angeles 1986). Project 3 is considered a utility installation, and therefore would be consistent with the N-1 land use designation. As a result, Project 3 would be consistent with the General Plan Land Use designation. Development of Project 3 will be consistent with permissible uses associated with the land use designation and the policies, goals, and objectives outlined in the Los Angeles County General Plan and the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, and will not be inconsistent with any applicable County plan. **(DEIR at 4.10-36)**.

The gen-tie lines for Project 3 are linear infrastructure that would not result in any changes to the existing land use patterns in the area of Project 3. The gen-tie lines would be located underground within Los Angeles County to the extent practicable, and aboveground within the City of Lancaster, either in a public road ROW or on private lands adjacent to the public road ROW. Within the City of Lancaster, the gen-tie line routes would traverse land use designations "NU" Residential and "UR" in the City of Lancaster. According to the County's Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, allowable uses in the N-1 designation include utility installations. Additionally, the City's NU land use designation permits solar generating facilities and utility installations within its designation. In July 2013, the City approved a General Plan Amendment for the UR designation to NU designation for another applicant's solar project that the gen-tie line would traverse to connect to the Antelope Substation. A franchise agreement will be obtained by the Applicant with the City of Lancaster for the gen-tie line that will traverse through this jurisdiction. This agreement will grant a utility franchise and right of way privileges for the proposed gen-tie line. Therefore, no impact to County and City Plans would occur**.** **(DEIR at 4.10-37)**.

The Project 3 site and its associated gen-tie line would be located within Fox Airfield's airport influence area ("AIA"), Zone C. Prohibited uses under Zone C include: children's schools, libraries, hospitals, nursing homes, buildings with more than three habitable floors above ground, highly noise-sensitive uses, and hazards to flight. Hazards to flight include physical (e.g. tall objects), visual, and electronic forms of interference with the safety of aircraft operations. Land use development that may cause the attraction of birds to increase is also prohibited (Los Angeles County ALUC 2004). Project 3 would be consistent with the Fox Airfield Land Use Compatibility Plan. Therefore impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.10-37)**.

The County's CUP entitlement process involves the discretionary review of a project, whereby conditions of approval for Project 3 would be assigned. A CUP Burden of Proof is required to be submitted to determine Project 3's consistency with the General Plan, compatibility with surrounding land uses, conditions to ensure compatibility, land suitability and physical constraints, project design, availability of adequate access, public services and facilities to serve the development, and identify potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures. As shown in DEIR Tables 4.10-1, 4.10-2, and 4.10-3, Project 3 is consistent with County land use designations and compatible with adjacent and surrounding land uses. **(DEIR at 4.10-43)**. The implementation of the environmental mitigation measures and CUP conditions would be expected to minimize Project 3's potential impacts, such that the Project could occur while maintaining zoning compliance within the designated zone. As a result, Project 3 would be consistent with the County's zoning designations. Permitting processes for those portions of the gen-tie lines located in the City of Lancaster would require necessary approvals from the City. Compliance with applicable City zoning regulations and conditions would ensure consistency with City's zoning designations. **(DEIR at 4.10-38)**.

Project 3 and lands adjacent to its associated gen-tie line ROW are located within the County's Heavy Agriculture (A-2) Zone. Project 3 is considered equivalent to an electric generating plant. Under the County zoning code for the A-2 zoning designation (Los Angeles County Code Section 22.24.150), electric generating plants and transmission substations are allowed in the A-2 zones with the issuance of a CUP. Lands adjacent to the gen-tie line for Project 3 would consist of the City's RR 2.5 Zone. The proposed gen-tie lines would be constructed underground within Los Angeles County unless other applicable regulations require above-ground installation and aboveground or underground within the City of Lancaster. The gen-tie lines would be located on private lands adjacent to the public road ROW or within the public road ROW. They are linear facilities that would not result in any changes to the existing land use patterns in the Project 3 area, and would be permitted as part of respective County CUP and City permitting requirements. **(DEIR at 4.10-38)**. As a result, implementation of Project 3 and its associated gen-tie lines would be expected to be consistent with County and City zoning designations, and would result in a less than significant impact relative to the A-2 zoning in Los Angeles County and the RR 2.5 zoning in the City of Lancaster.

As discussed in DEIR Section 4.4 Biological Resources, Project 3 and its associated gen-tie lines are not located within a designated SEA; therefore, SEA conformance criteria do not apply. Project 3 and the area for its associated gen-tie lines contain generally low slopes of less than 1 percent gradient, and would not be located within or conflict with designated Hillside Management Areas. Therefore, no impacts would occur. **(DEIR at 4.10-39)**.

Project 3 is located within an Agricultural Opportunity Area, as discussed in Section 4.2 of the DEIR. Project 3 would generate electrical power through renewable solar PV technology which is an allowable use with a CUP. Project 3 would convert land that was formerly used for agricultural production, to renewable energy production. Construction and operation of Project 3 would not involve other restrictions, obstructions, or resources that could result in conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use. Additionally, Project 3 would be located on fallow land that is currently not irrigated, with surrounding parcels being mostly undeveloped and fallow agricultural land. Project 3 would produce power in a passive manner and would result in

minimal air emissions, traffic, and noise, and would not affect adjacent agricultural operations. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(DEIR at 4.10-40)**.

Project 3 contains no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as discussed in DEIR Section 4.2 Agriculture and Forestry. Therefore, Project 3 will have no impact to Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. **(DEIR at 4.10-40)**. No railroads are located within 0.5 miles from Project 3 and its gen-tie line. The nearest major highway is State Route 14, which is located approximately 4.8 miles east of Project 3. Project 3 is located approximately 1.3 miles west of Fox Airfield and within Zone C of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Fox Airfield. Zone C contains most of the 55 CNEL contour. Prohibited uses under Zone C include: children's schools, libraries, hospitals, nursing homes, buildings greater than 3 habitable floors above ground, highly noise-sensitive uses (such as outdoor theaters), and hazards to flights. Project 3 represents a permitted use in this area, and a less than significant impact would occur with regard to any noise management areas. **(DEIR at 4.10-42)**.

Project 3 and its associated gen-tie lines are located within the 500-year floodplain Zone X (Unshaded). These areas are known to be of a very low flood risk. All of the Project 3 area would be developed, and measures would be taken in the design of the site's solar panels to account for the flood hazards. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(DEIR at 4.10-41)**.

2.11 NOISE

Potential Effect:

Project 3 would have a significant Noise impact if it would: result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the project; result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; for a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels; or, for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 3 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Noise.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Construction of Project 3 would take place between the second and fourth quarters of 2014. Sound generated from Project 3 would consist of: (1) short duration sounds resulting from

construction activities, and (2) sound during normal facility operations. Vibration from Project 3 would only result during construction. Construction activities would take place only during daytime hours. An evaluation of expected noise and vibration levels was performed, and the ability of Project 3 to comply with applicable noise requirements was assessed.

The Draft EIR determined that the construction noise for Project 3 would be similar to that of Project 1; therefore, the Draft EIR's discussion of Project 3's noise impacts focused on the differences between Project 1 and Project 3, namely received sound levels at the nearest noise sensitive receptor. **(DEIR at 4.11-34)**. These Findings refer to certain facts from the Draft EIR's discussion of Project 1 noise impacts that are also applicable to Project 3.

For Project 3, the following criteria were determined to be inapplicable or to result in no impact:

- Exposure of on-site workers to noise levels that exceed occupational safety standards (90 dBA as a time-weighted 8-hour average or peak noise levels above 115 dBA).

- Exposure of residents to airport or private airstrip-related noise levels above a CNEL of 65 dBA.

Occupational noise exposure is governed by federal and state regulations. Cal/OSHA administers industrial safety regulations in California. Cal/OSHA regulations establish a time-weighted noise exposure limit of 90 dBA averaged over 8 hours (CCR, Title 8, Article 105). Noise source controls, administrative procedures, or worker hearing protection must be provided if worker noise exposure would exceed the 90 dBA limit. The construction contractor selected for the Project would be required to follow Cal/OSHA requirements for construction worker noise exposure. **(DEIR at 4.11-25; 4.11-30)**.

Sound from construction equipment would vary, depending on the construction phase and the number and class of equipment at a location at any given time. Actual received sound levels would fluctuate, depending on the construction activity, equipment type, and separation distances between source and receiver. **(DEIR at 4.11-30)**. Construction noise is a temporary noise source that would only occur during daytime hours. Sound levels from construction are expected to be comparable to sound produced by farm machinery, such as equipment used in nearby agricultural fields. Worst case construction noise levels for the nearest residence would last no more than a few weeks, as construction activities progress across Project 3. Therefore, no one residence would be exposed to significant noise levels for any extended period of time. **(DEIR at 4.11-27)**.

Sound from pile driving would attenuate to 88 dBA at the nearest residence to Project 3, and would attenuate to below 60 dBA within 1 linear mile of this construction activity, depending on meteorological and topographical effects. The average noise level from pile driving is predicted to be 68 dBA, similar to the level resulting at the Project centroid located 1,271 feet from the nearest residence. Because sound levels would be higher than 60 dBA at times, and up to 88 dBA at the closest residence, an exceedance of the County's construction noise level limits is anticipated. Therefore, where pile driving is planned to occur within 3,000 feet of an occupied noise sensitive receptor, an acoustic curtain or sound barrier with a sound transmission class of 19 or greater will be used to reduce received sound levels at the noise sensitive receptors to

levels at or below the County's construction noise limit of 60 dBA. Pile driving is expected to last more than 10 days, and a variance from the County of Los Angeles noise ordinance will be required. **(DEIR at 4.11-35)**.

Traffic noise generated during construction of Project 3 on and offsite would temporarily add to overall sound levels. As a general construction practice, functional mufflers would be maintained on all equipment to maintain noise levels as low as reasonably achievable. The Project 3 Applicant would make reasonable efforts to minimize noise resulting from construction activities, as described in Mitigation Measures N1 - N6. In sum, with mitigation measures implemented, including the use of sound curtains or barriers during pile driving, construction sound levels would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.11-27; 4.11-31)**.

Like noise from pile driving, vibration from pile driving would only last for a few weeks at most, and would move throughout the Project rapidly with no single noise sensitive receptor experiencing the peak 0.1 PPV for more than an few hours, which will be perceptible but will not damage structures. Therefore, exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels due to the construction of Project 3 and the gen-tie line will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.11-49)**.

General William J. Fox Airfield is located approximately one mile from Project 3. Residences near Project 3 are all located outside of the 65 dBA CNEL noise contour, which is the highest aviation sound level associated with compatible residential land uses according to FAA regulations (49 USC sections 47501-47510). One residence located 340 feet north of Project 3 is within the 55-60 dBA CNEL noise contour band. Sound contours developed for General William J. Fox Airfield indicate that Project 3 is within the 55-60 dBA CNEL noise contour and Zone C, the extended approach/departure zone. According to the airport's land use compatibility plan (Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission 2004), industrial uses such as utilities are acceptable uses in this zone. Sound levels from aviation activities would continue to dominate the acoustic environment, and sounds from Project 3 would not result in an increase in noise levels. Further from the airport but still relatively close to Project 3 (within approximately 1,000 feet) are a number of other residences. These residences are all assumed to be within the 40 dBA CNEL noise contour for the airport. Although noise contour mapping for the airport does not extend out this far, 40 dBA CNEL is a reasonably conservative assumption. Project 3 sound levels are not of sufficient strength to increase the acoustic environment at these residences either. For example, even assuming that Project 3 sound levels received at these residences are 40 dBA CNEL, the net increase would only be 3 dBA, which is less than significant. Project 3 sound levels would be less than 40 dBA CNEL; therefore there is no anticipated change in sound levels, and Project impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.11-52)**.

Once operational, Project 3 would generate power using PV modules mounted in rows of parallel racks. The Project is anticipated to be unmanned during normal operation. Systems monitoring would be completed remotely and onsite staff would be limited to repair or cleaning of the PV modules. Maintenance staff would visit two times per year to clean the PV modules, seasonally to clear vegetation, and as needed to perform other general maintenance activities. **(DEIR at 4.11-35)**. Sound sources considered in the operational acoustic analysis include the inverters and transformers associated with the PV modules, the substation, and the transmission line. The

principal sources of noise are the cooling-ventilation fans, the electrical components of the inverters and the step-up transformers at the on-site substations. Noise generated by this equipment would be less than significant. Gen-tie lines for Project 3 would be above ground, and could be a source of corona noise. However, because corona noise is typically attributed to higher voltage lines of approximately 345 kV and above, noise complaints from the Project's lower voltage transmission lines (66 kV) are not anticipated. Operational sound sources are all predicted to be less than 35 dBA at nearby noise-sensitive receptors, and would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.11-35 to 4.11-37)**.

Project 3 impacts related to Noise are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

N-1 Construction operations would not occur between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday, or at any time on Sunday with the exception of limited low-noise generating potential night work with Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning and Public Works approval.

N-2 Construction site and access road maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour shall be established and enforced during the construction period.

N-3 Electrically-powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, except for devices like trucks, loaders, dozers, and other heavy equipment.

N-4 Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far as practicable, and no closer than 1,000 feet, from noise-sensitive receptors.

N-5 The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells are prohibited except where required by OSHA or for safety or emergency warning purposes required by other regulatory agencies.

N-6 Project-related public address or music systems used on-site shall not be audible at any adjacent receptor.

N-7 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 which are in compliance with any applicable legally required equipment noise standards. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors) shall be equipped with shrouds and/or other noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment. Mobile sound barriers with a sound transmission class of 19 or greater will be used for pile driving on Projects where received sound levels at the nearest noise sensitive receptor are predicted to be above the County construction noise limit of 60 dBA during the day. With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site

substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may need to incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including:

N-8 Siting substations to achieve National Electrical Manufacturers Association ("NEMA") sound ratings at sensitive receptors as described in Section 4.11.5.2 not to be closer to the property line of sensitive receptors than the following distances for each individual project:

- Project 3 – 650 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 74 dBA

N-9 The Applicant shall use NEMA low noise rated transformer equipment which will achieve 10 dBA or greater noise reduction as compared to standard NEMA-rated transformers of a similar size and rated capacity to ensure that Project noise impacts would be less than significant.

2.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

Potential Effect:

Project 3 would have a significant impact on Public Services if it would create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection; sheriff protection; schools; parks; libraries, or other public facilities.

Finding:

Project 3 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Public Services. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 3 is located within the LACFD Battalion 11 service area. Station 112, which is 2.2 miles northwest of Project 3, is the jurisdictional station (i.e. the first-responder) to respond to incidents at the site. Additional fire stations within Battalion 11 (identified in DEIR Table 4.12-1) would also potentially be dispatched to respond to fire protection needs at the site. **(DEIR at 4.12-7)**.

During construction, workers would be temporary and would not be expected to relocate to the Project 3 area, as they would mostly be hired from the available local workforce, and would not be expected to result in significant changes to the local population; therefore, the construction of Project 3 is not anticipated to create significant changes to the local population that would increase the level of demand on fire protection services or that would increase the level of demand on the fire department services such that additional staff would be needed. **(DEIR at 4.12-7, 8)**.

As discussed in DEIR Section 4.13, Transportation and Traffic, construction of Project 3 would not result in significant traffic impacts. The Project 3 gen-tie line would interconnect to an existing transmission line adjacent to the Project 3 site; therefore, it is anticipated that no street closures would be required for the construction of Project 3. **(DEIR at 4.12-8)**.

Based on the Applicant's commitment to conformance of construction activities at the Project 3 site and gen-tie line ROW to federal, state, and Los Angeles County ordinances for fire protection, and implementation of mitigation related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials, construction would not be expected to result in significant special fire problems or hazards. Additionally, construction traffic at the site would not be anticipated to have a significant impact on local intersections and road segments. Therefore, Project 3 impacts to LACFD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-8)**.

Operations activities at Project 3 would typically be associated with routine maintenance carried out on-site and along the associated gen-tie ROWs at periodic intervals by a small maintenance crew. These activities would not result in effects to LACFD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection during operations of Project 3; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. In addition, the Applicant would be required to pay taxes as per the Proposition E Special Tax and property tax assessments, which are allocated to the LACFD. These taxes are designed to provide for potential increases in LACFD fire protection service demands to accommodate for new and existing developments. **(DEIR at 4.12-11).**

The Project 3 site is located within the LACSD Field Operations Region 1 service area. The Lancaster Station, which is approximately 7 miles southeast of Project 3, would likely be the first responder to incidents at the site. Currently the station maintains an officer-to-population service ratio of approximately 1 to 1,000. Project 3 does not involve any residential uses, and would not be considered to result in significant increases to population. During construction, workers would be temporary, and would not be expected to relocate to the area as they would mostly be hired from the available local workforce. The employees are planned to be hired from the available local workforce, and would not be expected to result in significant changes to the local population that would increase the level of demand on law enforcement services. **(DEIR at 4.12-12)**.

Sheriff services potentially required at Project 3 would likely include incidents of vandalism or theft. While these incidents would require sheriff services, they are not considered emergency response incidents, and as such would not affect emergency response times. As discussed in DEIR Section 4.13, Transportation and Traffic, construction of Project 3 would not result in significant traffic impacts. The Project 3 gen-tie line would interconnect to an existing transmission line adjacent to the Project 3 site; therefore, it is anticipated that no street closures would be required for the construction of Project 3. Therefore, impacts from the construction of Project 3 to LACSD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for sheriff protection would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-13)**.

Project 3 and its associated gen-tie lines do not include residential development or the influx of long-term workers from outside the area, and accordingly would not generate population growth. Consequently, no new demands on school facilities, parks, library facilities or other public

facilities are expected, and no impact would occur to these facilities. **(DEIR at 4.12-15; 4.12-16)**.

2.13 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Potential Effect:

Project 3 would have a significant impact on Transportation and Traffic if it would: conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit; 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; result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks; substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); result in inadequate emergency access; or conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 3 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Transportation and Traffic.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Traffic generated during the construction phase of Project 3 and its gen-tie line would include construction worker commuter trips, water truck trips, and delivery truck trips. Construction worker commuter trips and delivery truck trips are anticipated to arrive to the Project 3 site outside of peak hours. It is anticipated that 30 percent of water trucks would arrive to the Project site during the AM peak hour. Project 3 would have an average of 88 workers per day and a peak of 130 workers per day over a 20-day period during construction. For equipment and materials, Project 3 would have an average of 5 delivery truck trips per day with an expected peak of 23 delivery truck trips. It is anticipated that construction workers and delivery trucks would arrive to the Project 3 site outside of peak hours. **(DEIR at 4.13-29)**.

Dependent upon climatic conditions during construction, the maximum estimated water use for the Project 3 site is 82 acre-feet, which would be obtained from an off-site provider. Potable water would be brought in to the Project 3 site for drinking and domestic needs. During the site preparation and grading activities, water would mainly be used for soil compaction and control of fugitive dust generation. Subsequent to these construction activities, water usage would primarily be used for on-going dust suppression associated with the remaining construction of the Project. Project 3 would require a total of 29 daily water truck trips arriving on-site.

Assuming that 30 percent of the water trucks would arrive on-site during the AM peak hour (7:00 AM), 9 water trucks were used in this analysis. As shown in DEIR Tables 4.13-15 and 4.13-16, the local roads would experience a maximum increase in traffic volume of 34.62 percent during the AM peak hour. This is mainly due to the existing low volume and low peak traffic conditions for these roads, which are located in rural areas and operate well below the existing capacity of 1,600 vehicles per lane per hour for a 2-lane road. Therefore, it is concluded that these roads have adequate capacity to safely accommodate the increase from water truck traffic and would have a less than significant impact on the existing traffic conditions. **(DEIR at 4.13-32)**.

During construction of gen-tie lines associated with Project 3, it is anticipated that temporary, one-lane road closures would be necessary. A Project Traffic Plan would be prepared to address the temporary one-lane road closures and submitted to the County for approval prior to issuance/approval of the County Grading Permit, as indicated in Mitigation Measure TT-2. Parking, temporary office trailers, and construction and PV equipment lay-down areas would be located entirely within the Project 3 site boundary. The construction traffic impacts would be temporary, and less than significant with mitigation. **(DEIR at 4.13-33)**.

The operational phase of Project 3 is anticipated to only generate an average of 4 additional vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hours on a quarterly or as-needed basis with a maximum of 12 additional trips, which would only occur when panel washing operations are being conducted. Based on the traffic analysis for the water truck trips described above, the operational phase vehicle trips are considered negligible. Therefore, no additional post-construction operational analysis was conducted. The operational phase of Project 3 would have a less than significant impact on the traffic and/or transportation infrastructure. **(DEIR at 4.13-33)**. Project 3 would not conflict with any applicable congestion management programs during the construction or operational phases. **(DEIR at 4.13-39)**.

Project 3 is within the General William J. Fox Airfield airport influence area. After consulting with the Los Angeles County ALUC, the ALUC notified the Applicant that no further review of Project 3 is required, because there is no anticipated impact. The consultation is included in Appendix B-12 of the Draft EIR. Therefore, air traffic would not be impacted by implementation of the Projects. The Projects would not include any buildings, structures, or other operations that would result in a change in existing air traffic patterns. The PV modules that would be used at the individual Project sites would be non-reflective and would not pose a hazard to air traffic. The Project 3 SGF would be connecting to the existing SCEAS via a 66 kV gen-tie line. Transmission line-related radio frequency interference ("RFI") is one of the indirect effects of transmission line operation. RFI is produced by the physical interactions of the electric fields generated by the transmission line. The level of RFI that occurs usually depends on the magnitude of the electric fields involved and the distance from the transmission line. It is usually associated with transmission lines of 345 kilovolts (kV) or greater. The Project transmission lines would connect to the existing SCE network with a 66 kV gen-tie line (less than 345 kV) and is not expected to adversely impact the surrounding areas with RFI effects. **(DEIR at 4.13-33; 4.13-39)**.

No existing roads would be altered by Project 3, and Project 3 does not include design features or uses that would substantially increase any hazards. Parking, temporary office trailers, and

construction and PV equipment lay-down areas would be located entirely within the Project 3 site boundary. Only temporary one-lane road closures are expected for the construction of the Gen-tie Lines. A Project Traffic Plan would be prepared to address the temporary one-lane road closures and submitted to the County for approval prior to issuance/approval of the Grading Permit. Therefore, Project 3 would not result in inadequate emergency access. Project 3 is located in rural areas of Los Angeles County and would not significantly decrease the performance or safety of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. **(DEIR at 4.13-40)**.

Project 3 impacts related to Transportation and Traffic are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

TT-1 Prior to issuance of a grading permit, Applicant shall document and submit all required information and/or material pertaining to the pavement conditions of construction routes for the Projects, including the formula for calculation of the Projects' fair share of any repair or reconstruction of construction routes to the satisfaction of LACDPW. Applicant shall reimburse the County of Los Angeles for the cost of any repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes attributable to the Projects as agreed to by LACDPW. The timing of any necessary repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes and the required payment by the Applicant shall be determined by LACDPW.

TT-2 Prior to any construction activities and/or issuance of required encroachment permits from Los Angeles County, the Applicant shall prepare worksite traffic control plans for review and approval from LACDPW and other affected agencies for any closures, partial closures of public streets, or work within or adjacent to the road right-of-way that impacts the movement of traffic. The Plans shall be prepared in accordance with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (2012).

TT-3 Additionally, the County, including LACFD Fire Stations 78 (for R2011-00801) and 130 (for R2011-000798, 00799, 00805,00807, & 00833) shall be notified at least three days in advance of any street closures that may affect fire and/or paramedic responses in the area. The Applicant shall provide alternate route (detour) plans to the County, including three sets to LACFD, with a tentative schedule of planned closures, prior to the beginning of construction.

TT-4 Stagger construction work shifts before or after peak traffic hours.

TT-5 Schedule truck deliveries during off peak hours.

TT-6 Limit water truck deliveries during the AM peak hour to 30 percent of the daily water truck trips. All other trips shall be at off peak hours.

TT-7 Prior to start of construction activities, Applicant shall provide worker education encouraging carpooling and vanpooling by workers and shall provide assistance for organizing vanpools and carpools. A log will be developed to show compliance.

2.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Potential Effect:

Project 3 would have a significant impact on Utilities and Service Systems if it would: exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards; create water or wastewater system capacity problems, 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; create drainage system capacity problems, 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; not have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses; create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; or create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Finding:

Project 3 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Utilities and Service Systems. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The construction of Project 3 and its associated gen-tie lines would generate temporary and limited wastewater as a result of on-site construction workers. The wastewater generated would be collected at the on-site mobile sanitation facilities and then transported to a nearby wastewater disposal facility. In the event that additional wastewater is generated from construction activities, water would be stored in an on-site tank system and would be disposed of at an approved wastewater treatment facility. Construction and operational wastewater will be limited in quantity and significantly below wastewater treatment requirements of Los Angeles County and the RWQCB. **(DEIR at 4.14-14)**.

All wastewater would be treated according to the treatment requirements enforced by the NPDES permit authorized by the Lahonton Regional Water Quality Control Board ("LRWQCB"). Additionally, semi-annual washing of the PV modules would generate minimal wastewater during operation. However, since the wash water would only consist of demineralized water and dust washed off of the modules, it would not need to be treated at a wastewater treatment facility. This wash water would be allowed to infiltrate into the ground and evaporate as it drips off the PV modules. The wastewater generated from maintenance workers would be collected at the on-site temporary mobile sanitation facilities and then transported to a nearby wastewater treatment facility. Project 3 would not exceed the requirements of LRWQCB,

and therefore impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-14)**. Likewise, construction and operation of Project 3 would not exceed the capacity of any treatment plant, and would have no impact to a wastewater system. Consequently, no new wastewater treatment facilities would need to be created and no existing facilities would need to be expanded. The maximum construction water use of Project 3 is 82 acre feet, and the maximum operational water use of Project 3 is 5.1 acre feet per year. No water system capacity problems would be created, and no new water systems or expansion of existing systems would be required. **(DEIR at 4.14-16)**.

Project Site 3 currently drains from west to east; the post-development condition would maintain this flow path. A SWPPP incorporating BMPs for temporary stormwater management would be prepared and approved before the construction of Project 3 and its gen-tie lines. The final design of Project 3 would allow the pre-development runoff amount to continue to sheet flow in the post-development condition to avoid disturbance to downstream drainage structures or wildlife. The design of Project 3 would eliminate the need for new drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, Project 3 would have a less than significant impact on drainage facilities. **(DEIR at 4.14-18)**.

The construction for Project 3 and the Project 3 gen-tie lines would create a short-term temporary demand for water, primarily in association with dust control. The Applicant would provide a Dust Control Plan to the County prior to the start of construction activities. The plan would detail site-specific dust control measures designed to minimize water use during construction activities, while minimizing fugitive dust emissions. Project 3's maximum construction water use is 82 ac-ft. It is estimated that the Project 3 site would have potentially historically required at least 353 ac-ft of water per year for agriculture. Thus, the maximum construction water use of Project 3 is substantially less than the best estimate of water use of 353 AFY for agriculture, which was historically the primary land use of surrounding land. Based on potential estimated historic groundwater use at the site, there may be adequate groundwater supply within the western portion of the Basin to meet Project 3's construction water needs. In addition, according to the Antelope Valley Integrated Regional Water Management Plan ("IRWMP"), groundwater is considered a reliable water source in the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin.

However, given that the Adjudication will not likely be resolved during construction of Project 3, water for Project 3 would be supplied via truck from either Homer LLC, or the City of Lancaster, both of which have provided "Will Serve" letters indicating their ability to meet the water demands of Project 3. Homer LLC would provide out-of- Basin water stored in the Antelope Valley Water Bank. Potential recycled water providers are Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40, Los Angeles County Sanitation District, and Palmdale Water District. The City of Lancaster has a current supply capacity of approximately 16 million gallons per day of treated wastewater that is suitable for construction use and panel washing. **(Final EIR at p. 256)**.

As previously discussed, the potential estimated historical agricultural water usage for the Project 3 site was determined to be at least 353 AFY. Project 3's maximum construction water use is 82 ac-ft, which equates to 76.3 percent less than the potential estimated historical annual agricultural groundwater usage at the site. Either of the sources noted above would have

sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the Project 3 construction demands from existing water source entitlements and water resources. Therefore the impacts from water usage during construction would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-22)**.

During operations, the maximum water use for Project 3 would be 5.1 AFY. A maximum of 5.1 AFY of additional water may be needed in the first 2 years of operation to establish the plants for the landscaping buffer. It is unlikely, but possible that additional water (up to 5.1 AFY) may be needed later during the operations phase for supplemental plantings if landscape vegetation expires and has to be replaced. As with the Project 3 water needs during construction, during operations Homer LLC would also provide out-of-Basin water stored in the Antelope Valley Water Bank. This option would provide a reliable source of water for operations. Potential recycled water providers are Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40, Los Angeles County Sanitation District, and Palmdale Water District. The City of Lancaster has a current supply capacity of approximately 16 million gallons per day of treated wastewater that is suitable for construction use and panel washing. **(Final EIR at p. 256)**. Therefore, the impacts from water usage during operations would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-22)**.

Project 3 and its associated gen-tie lines do not require natural gas or propane during construction or operation; therefore there would be no system capacity problems for those utilities. Since natural gas and propane are not needed for Project 3, no new energy facilities would need to be created, and no existing facilities would need to be expanded. Project 3 may require electricity for the construction equipment and for lighting construction activities. The electricity would likely come from one of the existing SCE lines located on the west and south sides of the site. Electricity consumption during construction would be temporary, and would vary depending on the phase of construction. Overall, the construction of Project 3 would require limited electrical consumption that the existing electrical grid has capacity to serve. Therefore, Project 3 would have a less than significant impact on energy utility system capacity during construction. **(DEIR at 4.14-25)**.

Project 3 would also require electricity for ongoing maintenance operations, lighting, security systems, and other various operational needs. During daylight hours, the electricity needs for Project 3 would be supplied by Project 3's electricity generation. During non-daylight hours, the electricity needs for Project 3 would be provided by either backfeed from the electrical grid, through the proposed gen-tie, or through the existing SCE lines located on the west and south sides of the Project 3 site. Therefore, Project 3 would have a less than significant impact on energy utility system capacity. **(DEIR at 4.14-26)**.

Construction of Project 3 would require minimal ground disturbance during the facility installation. Solid waste generated from construction of Project 3 (and gen-tie lines) may include paper, wood, glass, plastics from packing material, waste lumber, insulation, scrap metal and concrete, empty non-hazardous containers, and vegetation wastes. In accordance with Title 22 Chapter 22.52, 65 percent of construction and demolition debris would be recycled. Any material that cannot be recycled would be properly disposed of at a regional disposal facility. Any defective or broken solar modules would be returned to the manufacturer for recycling. In accordance with Title 22 Chapter 20.87, the Applicant would prepare a Recycling and Reuse

Plan and progress reports to implement and document the Project's recycling practices. Therefore, Project 3 construction impacts on landfill and solid waste disposal capacity would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-26)**. Once the SGF is installed, there would be minimal waste generated during Project 3 operations; therefore Project 3 will have a less than significant impact on landfill and solid waste disposal capacity during operations. **(DEIR at 4.14-27)**.

Non-hazardous waste generated during construction, operation, and decommissioning of Project 3 (and gen-tie lines) would be transferred by licensed waste hauling contractors and recycled or disposed of in compliance with local and state regulations. Hazardous wastes would be shipped offsite and treated or disposed in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations for hazardous waste management. The construction contractor would prepare a Project-specific hazardous materials management and hazardous waste management program for Project 3. Project 3 would have no impact relative to compliance with existing federal or state regulations pertaining to solid waste, because Project 3 would be required to comply with all relevant regulations during construction, operation and decommissioning. **(DEIR at 4.14-27)**.

SECTION 3.0 FINDINGS REGARDING CUMULATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH ARE NOT SIGNIFICANT OR WHICH HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

Pursuant to Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines, the following findings and statements of fact identify potentially significant cumulative impacts and Project 3's incremental contribution to the impacts discussed in the Final EIR, in the context of the other five Projects and other cumulative projects. For the following environmental resource areas, Project 3's incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable, and no cumulatively significant impact will occur.

3.1 AESTHETICS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 3), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Aesthetics.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 3, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects. Project 3, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Aesthetics.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Individually, with mitigation, each of the six proposed SGF Projects can each be expected to have a less than significant impact on aesthetic resources. The Project sites comprise 987.1 acres, or 0.6 percent of the total area within the 5 mile radius. Within the 5-mile radius area, there are 20,909 acres of development listed by individual projects, as shown in DEIR Table 3-7. These

development projects, including the Applicant's Projects, comprise 12.6 percent of the area identified in DEIR Figure 3-5 and include solar projects, commercial projects, and residential projects.

From elevated viewpoints, the western Antelope Valley appears as a mosaic of agricultural lands, suburban developments, and open land. From a distance, the proposed SGFs would not appear dissimilar to agricultural fields or existing PV facilities in shape and size. The other solar and real estate developments proposed for the western Antelope Valley would not appear dissimilar to existing land use patterns. From level viewpoints, such as those along local roads, solar or residential/commercial developments would not be prominent unless the observer is directly adjacent to the facility. Because of the flat nature of the Antelope Valley landscape, developments would quickly become less prominent as the viewer travels away from them. In addition, the scenic character on the valley floor is generally low. Existing commercial, residential, and energy developments (including substations, high-voltage transmission lines, distribution lines, and generation facilities) are scattered throughout the valley.

A 12.6 percent level of increase in development within 5 miles of each of the Project sites is not anticipated to be significant from elevated or level viewpoints, because the proposed developments would appear similar to existing developments in the Antelope Valley, and cover only a very small portion of the land within 5 miles of each proposed Project site. Views of open desert lands would still exist, and the flatness of the landscape would limit the prominence of new developments with increasing distance.

The proposed Projects and other proposed projects within the cumulative impacts study area would be individually required to comply with the Los Angeles County General Plan goals and policies, and the Antelope Valley Area Plan policies, as well as applicable ordinances such as the Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance, as they are applicable to aesthetic resources, as identified in Section 4.1.3 of the DEIR. Any cumulative aesthetic impacts would be reduced to a level that is less than significant with mitigation by application of these regulations, and mitigation measures A-1 to A-5. **(DEIR at 4.1-114 to 4.1-115)**.

3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Cumulative impacts to Agriculture and Forestry Resources could occur in the event that Project 3, in conjunction with the six proposed SGF Projects and other cumulative projects results in the area results in a cumulatively significant loss of Important Farmlands or Williamson Act contracted lands.

Finding:

Project 3, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Agriculture and Forestry Resources. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see DEIR Table 3-7). For the purposes of this cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable law ordinances regulations and standards.

Projects 1 – 6 are located in a region with significant agricultural uses. However, the Antelope Valley has been historically and is currently limited by water costs and climate conditions. Cumulatively, the Projects would not develop land classified as Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Project 4 is the only site that currently contains land designated as Prime Farmland and of Statewide Importance. As mentioned above, the DOC is in process of reclassifying Project 4 land currently mapped as Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance to Grazing Land on the 2012 edition of the Important Farmland Map for Los Angeles County. The Projects would not be expected to contribute to the overall trend of conversion of agricultural lands to other uses in the Antelope Valley when considered together with other potential cumulative projects in the area. That said, it is contemplated that at the end of the anticipated 35-year life of Projects 1-6, the associated properties could be returned to agricultural use. The Projects' incremental contribution to cumulative agricultural impacts is considered less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-9)**.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 3), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Air Quality.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 3, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Air Quality. Project 3, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Air Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Twenty-nine related projects have been identified within the proposed Projects' vicinity; locations are listed in DEIR Figure 4.3-2, "Cumulative Projects in the Region". Of these 29 related projects, there are a number of related projects that have not yet been built or are currently under construction. Since the Applicant has no control over the timing or sequencing of the related projects, and the level of emissions that would be generated by the related projects is uncertain, it is infeasible and speculative to prepare a quantitative analysis to ascertain daily construction emissions that would occur under a worst-case scenario of all 29 related projects being constructed concurrently with the Applicant's six Projects.

For this reason, the AVAQMD was consulted to assess the cumulative impact resulting only from the Applicant's six Projects. The County's EIR consultant (Tetra Tech) met with AVAQMD officials and technical staff at the AVAQMD's office on May 29, 2012, and discussed the proper cumulative Air Quality analysis methodology for the Project pursuant to CEQA. **(DEIR at 4.3-48)**. AVAQMD determined that cumulative impacts from the Applicant's six Projects should be cumulatively quantified based on size, construction equipment per phase, and construction phase duration, and that the related projects should only be qualitatively discussed within the EIR. The cumulative Air Quality analysis was performed based on the direction from AVAQMD, and included the analysis of concurrent construction and operation emissions sources on any one maximum construction day, air dispersion modeling method, and risk assessment method. **(DEIR at 4.3-48)**.

As previously discussed in the analyses above (DEIR Table 4.3-13, "Peak Annual Construction Emissions"; DEIR Table 4.3-20, "Peak Annual Operation Emissions"; and DEIR Table 4.3-22, "Concurrent Health Risk Assessment"), emissions from overlapping construction phases of the Applicant's six projects would not exceed the AVAQMD thresholds on any maximum day or year during construction or operations. **(DEIR 4.3-30; 4.3-49)**.

With respect to the Project's construction-period air quality emissions and cumulative Basin-wide conditions, the AVAQMD has developed strategies to reduce criteria pollutant emissions outlined in the Air Quality Management Plan ("AQMP") pursuant to CAA mandates. As such, Project 3 would comply with AVAQMD Rule 403 requirements, and implement all feasible mitigation measures. In addition, Project 3 would comply with adopted AQMP emissions control measures. Per AVAQMD rules and mandates and the CEQA requirement that significant impacts be mitigated to the extent feasible, these same requirements (i.e., Rule 403 compliance, the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, and compliance with adopted AQMP emissions control measures) would also be imposed on construction projects Basin-wide, which would include each of the related projects mentioned below. **(DEIR 4.3-49)**.

By applying AVAQMD's cumulative air quality impact methodology, implementation of Projects 1 – 6 would not result in an addition of pollutants, such that considerable cumulative impacts in conjunction with related projects in the region would occur. Therefore, the emissions of nonattainment pollutants and precursors generated cumulatively by Projects 1 – 6 would be less than significant. Projects are deemed inconsistent with air quality plans when they result in population and/or employment growth that exceeds growth estimates in the applicable air quality plan. The SGF sites would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, which in this case is the Federal 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan (Western Mojave Desert Nonattainment Area). The Ozone Attainment Plan relies upon future year emission inventories consistent with California Air Resource Board ("CARB") and the adopted General Plan growth projections. As the proposed Projects are not part of an ongoing regulatory program, the AVAQMD recommends Project-specific air quality impacts be used to determine the potential cumulative impacts to regional air quality. As discussed above, peak daily emissions of operation-related pollutants would not exceed AVAQMD significance thresholds.

The combined Projects' emission estimates state that while Projects 1 – 6 would generate air emissions during construction and a minimal amount of GHG emissions during operations, the

Projects' incremental contribution, with mitigation, to cumulative air quality impacts do not exceed any air quality significance thresholds and would comply with the applicable AVAQMD AQMP. It should be noted that solar energy provided by the Projects is a much cleaner source of energy than traditional sources used for the generation of electricity, such as the burning of coal, fuel oil, or natural gas. Furthermore, since the percentage of GHG emissions generated by Projects 1 – 6 is so small; Projects 1 – 6 would provide a *de minimis* contribution to significant cumulative impacts caused by other projects in the region (as further discussed in DEIR Section 4.7, Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas). The Projects' emissions of non-attainment pollutants and precursors generated during operations with mitigation would not exceed the AVAQMD Project-level thresholds and are less than significant. As a result, Project-level emissions would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution, such that results in an increase in air pollutant emissions above those assumed in the regional AQMP. **(DEIR at 4.3-52)**.

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 3), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Biological Resources.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 3, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Biological Resources. Project 3, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Biological Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The total area included in the map in DEIR Figure 3-17 showing a 5.0 mile radius outward from each of the Project 1 – 6 solar sites comprises 165,349 acres. Solar development in the area is 8,086 acres (4.9 percent of the 165,349 acres shown in DEIR Figure 3-17). The Silverado Projects cover 987 acres (only 0.6 percent of the total area). Open space and wildlife mitigation lands would be acquired and preserved in perpetuity for Projects 1 – 6. Since the mitigation lands are intended to comprise higher quality wildlife habitat than those impacted by the Projects, impacts will be mitigated. The permanent nature of the land mitigation and preservation program to be implemented would assure that these new wildlife habitat mitigation lands would always be maintained and enhanced for wildlife values. Therefore, cumulative impacts from the Project would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.4-71)**.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 3), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Cultural Resources.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 3, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Cultural Resources. Project 3, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Cultural Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. As described above under impacts specific to Project 3, impacts related to cultural resources would be mitigated to less than significant levels, since the CRHR and NRHP eligible resources in the area would be avoided. Because impacts to cultural resources would be mitigated to less than significant through avoidance, Projects 1 – 6 would not result in an incremental increase in effects on cultural resources when combined with the other 29 projects. Therefore, no significant cumulative impacts would be expected to occur. **(DEIR at 4.5-35)**.

3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 3), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Geology and Soils.

Finding:

Project 3, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Geology and Soils. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). For the purposes of this

cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time.

It is assumed that construction of all of the cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards, and that geotechnical studies would be performed to assess and mitigate any geotechnical hazards associated with them; therefore, the cumulative projects would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects. It is also assumed that the cumulative projects would comply with all applicable erosion control and stormwater management laws, ordinances, regulations and standards, therefore the construction of the cumulative projects would not contribute to cumulative soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

Proposed Projects 1 – 6 would not expose the public to adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking because the Projects would be contained within a secure fenced area at each location and not open to the public. The potential for injury to workers is also quite low as they will not be on-site the majority of the time, and the likelihood that a seismic event would occur when workers are present is quite small. The Projects would also not result in significant soil erosion because the design and construction of the Projects' facilities would comply with all applicable building codes and standards established by regulatory agencies, including Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the CBC. The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would therefore not contribute incrementally to cumulative impacts resulting from other development within the 5-mile radius. **(DEIR at 4.6-27)**.

3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 3), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 3, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change. Project 3, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15355, a "cumulative impact" is an environmental effect that may result from the combination of two or more environmental effects associated with a proposed project, or from the combination of one or more project environmental effects with related environmental effects caused by other closely related projects. However, in the case of global climate change, the proximity of the Projects to other GHG-generating activities is not directly relevant to the determination of a cumulative impact. Although AB 32 sets statewide targets for future GHG emissions, the scoping plan and other implementing tools of the law are

clear that the reductions are not expected to occur uniformly from all sources or sectors. The conclusions related specifically to Project 3, above, highlights the manner by which the proposed Projects intend to meet many of these strategies.

Numerous options exist for project developers to reduce their contribution to city-, county-, and state-wide GHG emissions, while helping to meet the region's future housing, jobs, and infrastructure needs. However, it is not possible at this time to accurately quantify GHG emissions expected from the related Projects or the GHG reductions anticipated from the above-listed strategies. There is no certain basis for concluding that an emissions increase resulting from the Projects and the related Projects could cause a measurable increase in global GHG emissions sufficient to force global climate change due to the complex physical, chemical and atmospheric mechanisms involved in global climate change.

In addition, the emissions models used for Project-level evaluations do not fully reflect improvements in technology and other reductions in GHG emissions that are likely to occur pursuant to state regulations, such as AB 1493, SB 1368, AB 32, and Executive Order S-3-5, as well as future federal and/or state regulations. Therefore, it is not possible or meaningful to calculate emissions from each of the identified related Projects and compare that with a numeric threshold or reduction target. Projects 1-6 would be consistent with the state's goals in helping the state meet the RPS (DEIR Table 4.7-17), resulting in a GHG emission profile that is below established thresholds, and include implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-1 to GHG-5. Therefore, the Projects do not contribute considerably to cumulatively significant global climate change impacts. **(DEIR at 4.7-31)**.

3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 3), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 3, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Project 3, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see Table 3-7). For the purposes of this cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. It is assumed that for each of the cumulative

projects, Hazardous Materials Management Plans and Hazardous Waste Management Plans would be implemented, a SWPPP would be prepared, and all applicable environmental due diligence would be conducted (i.e., a Phase I ESA). If any of the cumulative projects are within an airport land use plan or airport influence area, the projects would obtain the appropriate authorizations and permitting from the respective Airport Land Use Commission. The cumulative projects would have a less than significant impact with mitigation to hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the land uses in the surrounding areas (primarily agricultural) and the limited amount and type of hazardous materials to be used as part of the proposed Projects 1 – 6, no significant incremental cumulative impacts associated with environmental safety are expected to occur as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed Projects 1 – 6. Regulations implemented by the Department of Toxic Substance Control ("DTSC"), LACSD, LACFD, and Cal/OSHA would require similar measures be applied to other developments in the region. Therefore, Projects 1 – 6 are not expected to result in significant incremental cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. **(DEIR at 4.8-19 to 4.8-20)**.

3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 3), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 3, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Hydrology and Water Quality. Project 3, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Project sites, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-3). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws ordinances regulations and standards. Projects located within 5 miles of the proposed Projects entail the geographic extent under consideration of cumulative impacts. The proposed Projects are six of several proposed renewable development projects that would impact existing and proposed land uses within the general Project area. As shown in DEIR Table 3-7 and DEIR Figure 3-17, the proposed Projects would entail approximately 0.60 percent of all proposed projects within a 5-mile radius.

All cumulative projects that may be approved and implemented would also assess potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality. The proposed Projects 1 – 6 were found to have less than significant impacts related to erosion, flooding, debris deposition, and stormwater quality, with no off-site impacts. Additionally, the proposed Projects would not result in any significant or unavoidable impacts and represent a small fraction of the total amount of lands affected by renewable projects and foreseeable projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects. Therefore, the proposed Projects would not be expected to significantly contribute to potential cumulative impacts associated with other projects in the Projects' region. **(DEIR at 4.9-45)**.

3.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 3), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Land Use and Planning.

Finding:

Project 3, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Land Use and Planning. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6. The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards. **(DEIR at 4.10-43)**.

Projects located within 5 miles of the proposed Projects entail the geographic extent under consideration of cumulative impacts. The proposed Projects are six of several proposed renewable development projects that would impact existing and proposed land uses within the general Project area. Similar potential impacts can result from these projects as from the Projects with respect to consistency with the subject general plan land use plans and policies, impacts to compatibility with surrounding land uses, and regulatory compliance with zoning ordinances. All cumulative projects that may be approved and implemented would also assess potential impacts related to land use and planning. The proposed Projects were found to have less than significant impacts related to compliance with County zoning, consistency with the County General Plan Land Use Plan intent and applicable land use conformance criteria, dividing an existing community, and with no significant impacts to the adjacent City of Lancaster. Additionally, the proposed Projects would not result in any significant or unavoidable land use impacts and represent a small fraction of the total amount of lands affected by renewable projects and foreseeable projects within a 5 mile radius of the Projects. Therefore, the proposed Projects would not be expected to significantly contribute to potential cumulative land use related impacts associated with other projects in the region. **(DEIR at 4.10-44)**.

3.11 NOISE

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 3), have the potential to result in cumulative Noise impacts.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 3, which mitigate or avoid significant Noise impacts. Project 3, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant Noise impact.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Two non-Applicant projects identified have the potential to result in cumulative construction noise impacts, due to the projects being located in relatively close proximity to the proposed Projects, but not close enough to result in vibration impacts. The Western Antelope Dry Ranch project (CUP 11-07) is located approximately 1-mile north of Project 2, and the High Desert LLC (CUP 10-03) project is located approximately 1-mile north of Project 4. These distances are close enough that construction noise could propagate out to distances near the Applicant's Projects, but are not close enough to potentially result in vibration impacts. The time period of construction for these two projects is unknown, but if construction were to overlap with construction of the proposed Projects, there is the potential for increased temporary noise levels at residences; however, none of the noise sensitive receptors that are located in close proximity to Project 4 are also located in close proximity to Antelope Solar 1 or Antelope Solar Farm projects. Therefore, sound levels from construction of the Projects would only be minimally increased (less than 1-2 dBA), or not at all, by simultaneous construction. Therefore, overall cumulative impacts of the proposed Projects 1 – 6 would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures N-1 to N-9. **(DEIR at 4.11-56)**.

3.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 3), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Public Services.

Finding:

Project 3, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Public Services. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Projects amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. It is assumed that for each of the cumulative projects, worksite traffic control plans, permits, and coordination with County departments regarding potential construction impacts would be implemented. **(DEIR at 4.12-16)**.

Projects 1 – 6 would not cause effects to result in significant demands to fire response times. Projects 1 – 6 would be designed with appropriate fire protection considerations, and would also result in less than significant impacts to staffing and response times. Furthermore, Projects 1 – 6 would be required to provide taxes to the County that are designed to address cumulative fire department needs associated with new and existing developments. Other developments in the vicinity of Projects 1 – 6 would also be required to pay taxes and fees to the County to provide for their potential increase to LACFD fire protection service demands (LACFD 2009). Additionally, all development in the area is subject to review and approval by the Fire Department. This ensures that all projects contain appropriate controls to reduce demand on the fire department. As a result, Projects 1 – 6 would be anticipated to result in less than significant incremental contributions to cumulative fire protection impacts. **(DEIR at 4.12-17)**.

Projects 1 – 6 would not cause effects to result in significant demands to sheriff staffing or response times. Projects 1 – 6 would also implement site security control, including 24-hour remotely monitored video cameras for security monitoring to prevent potential theft and vandalism activities. Additionally, a portion of Projects 1 – 6 taxes levied would be allocated to sheriff services. Other developments in the vicinity of Projects 1 – 6 would also be required to pay taxes that would be allocated to sheriff services. As a result, construction and operation of Projects 1 – 6 would be anticipated to result in less than significant incremental contributions to cumulative sheriff protection impacts. Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with sheriff services would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-17)**.

Because development of Projects 1-6 will not induce population growth, no direct or cumulative impacts to schools, parks, libraries or other public facilities will occur. **(DEIR at 4.12-15; 4.12-16)**.

3.13 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 3), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Transportation and Traffic.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 3, which mitigate or avoid significant impacts to Transportation and Traffic. Project 3, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Transportation and Traffic.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Cumulative impacts for transportation and traffic are the combined effect of Projects 1 – 6 with the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects (other projects). This Cumulative Impacts discussion addresses the cumulative impacts of the Applicant's Projects 1 – 6 and the other projects within a geographic radius of 5-mile radius of the Projects (Project Study Area), which could potentially coincide with the expected construction schedule of the Applicant's Projects. Based on evaluation of the Project Study Area and available data from Los Angeles County, there are 29 other projects that have the potential to contribute additional traffic volume within the vicinity of Projects 1-6.

Evaluation of the cumulative impacts within the Project Study Area was focused on the construction-phase traffic for Projects 1-6 and other projects within a 5-mile radius. As previously stated in the individual conclusions for Project 3 above, the operational phase for each Project is anticipated to only generate a maximum of 4 vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hours on a quarterly or as-needed basis with a maximum of 12 additional trips, which would only occur when panel washing operations are being conducted. Based on the traffic analysis contained in the DEIR, the operational phase vehicle trips/traffic for the Projects are considered negligible and would not result in a significant cumulative impact on the traffic and/or transportation infrastructure in the Project Study Area. **(DEIR at 4.13-41 to 4.13-43)**.

3.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 3), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Utilities and Service Systems.

Finding:

Project 3, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Utilities and Service Systems. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis

assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, and regulations. Construction and operation of the cumulative projects would result in less than significant impacts to public facilities, which include electricity, gas, wastewater, and solid waste services. During construction, all cumulative projects would follow required measures to prevent construction interference to utility services, and would comply with recycling requirements to minimize solid waste disposal at solid waste facilities. During operation, the solar and wind generation projects would provide electricity, and would generate minimal amounts of solid waste. During operation, the non-solar/non-wind commercial and residential development projects would generate solid waste as would be expected from these residential and commercial uses; it is assumed that these project proponents have planned for and mitigated for the additional solid waste generation as appropriate.

The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would provide their own electricity for operational needs, no natural gas would be required for their operations, little wastewater (from panel washing) would be generated as part of the operations process, and very little solid waste would be generated. As a result, the total cumulative impacts to utility services would be less than significant, and the incremental contribution of Projects 1 – 6 to cumulative impacts related to utility services would be less than significant. Furthermore, because the Applicant has committed to using out of Basin water during construction and operations, Projects 1 – 6 would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to water supply impacts in the Basin, and would have no significant cumulative effect on water supply. **(DEIR at 4.14-28)**.

SECTION 4.0 FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

These Findings and Statements of Fact regarding project alternatives and certain mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR are set forth to comply with Section 21002 of the Public Resources Code and Sections 15091(a)(3) and 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines. Five alternatives to the proposed Project (consisting of Projects 1-6) described in the Draft EIR were analyzed and considered as follows: 1) No Project Alternative; 2) Lower Intensity Projects; 3) Select Other Project Sites Alternative; 4) Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative; and 5) Wind Energy Generation Alternative. These alternatives constitute a reasonable range of alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. For the reasons set forth below, Alternatives 1-5 are rejected as infeasible for the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations set forth below.

4.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Description:

Under the No Project Alternative, Project sites 1-6 would remain in their present condition with site conditions (i.e., fallow agricultural land) as they currently exist.

Finding:

The No Project Alternative is rejected as infeasible because it fails to meet the Project goals and objectives, and would not contribute to the State's ability to meet its near- and long-term renewable energy generation goals and objectives.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would not be approved or implemented under the No Project Alternative. The potential environmental impacts and benefits of the proposed Projects would not occur as a direct consequence of implementation under the No Project Alternative. The No Project Alternative would involve taking no action to generate 172 MW of clean, renewable electrical power utilizing solar PV technology and to integrate the electrical output of the Projects into the electrical grid. This alternative would not allow one of the primary purposes of the proposed Projects which is to increase the output of renewable energy in support of the RPS, such that the State of California may meet its current and planned goals for increasing renewable generation at reasonable market rates.

The No Project Alternative assumes that the sites will remain as they currently exist (primarily fallow agricultural land) and no environmental impacts would result. In summary, the No Project Alternative is provided for comparative purposes to the proposed Projects 1 – 6. This alternative is incapable of meeting the stated goals and objectives of the Projects to provide 172 MW of renewable electric energy to utility providers, and does not contribute to the state's ability to meet its near-term and long-term renewable energy generation goals and objectives. **(DEIR 5-1 to 5-2)**.

4.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: LOWER INTENSITY PROJECTS

Description:

Under the Lower Intensity Projects Alternative, fewer than six sites would be developed, and the smaller projects would be developed in a size and configuration that would result in generation of fewer than 172 MW of electricity.

Finding:

The Lower Intensity Projects Alternative is rejected as infeasible because it partially fails to accomplish the goals of the proposed Projects, which are to provide 172 MW of clean, renewable electric energy using solar PV technology, and to deliver the electric output on a wholesale basis to utility providers.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Projects 1-6 are designed to meet the increasing demand for clean, renewable electrical power. Any reduction in the size of the effort results in a similar potential reduction in the reliance on foreign sources of fuel, the diversification of energy portfolios, the contribution to the reduction

of GHG emissions, and the generation of "green" jobs. It would also potentially reduce the contribution to the much needed on-peak power to the electrical grid in California.

The opportunity to develop solar power in Los Angeles County has a limited timeframe because the utility companies, which purchase the power, would purchase power from another entity if the proposed Projects are not completed in a timely manner. If Los Angeles County does not approve the six viable SGFs proposed here, the opportunity to contribute to the competitive solar generation business in the County will be further lost to other projects. The proposed Projects are well-positioned to compete in the industry, are comparatively environmentally superior to most other locations, and have good positions for PPAs and interconnection agreements. Additionally, any reduction of the megawatts produced from these Projects would further limit the County's contribution to the State's renewable energy production goals. These 5 to 52 MW Projects meet the utility industry needs for small projects, and any reduction of the respective Projects' size would jeopardize the success of the Projects. **(DEIR at 5-2)**.

4.3 ALTERNATIVE 3: SELECT OTHER PROJECT SITES ALTERNATIVE

Description:

Under the Select Other Project Sites Alternative, other properties could potentially be used for the six Project sites.

Finding:

The Select Other Project Sites Alternative is rejected, because this alternative would have the same or greater impacts to the environment as Projects 1-6, which can all be mitigated to below a level of significance.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

One key objective for the Project Applicant was to locate the Projects in an area with the following characteristics: (1) adequate solar radiation; (2) close proximity to interconnection locations for each solar site; (3) project sites with landowners who are willing to sell large enough parcels of land for solar generation at market price; (4) lack of threatened and/or endangered biological species on the site; (5) lack of nearby sensitive receptors or land uses to minimize potential conflicts with development (6) relatively flat sites that have previously been disturbed to minimize disturbance to native habitat and to minimize the need for site grading; (7) existing access to accommodate construction workforce needs; and (8) access to nearby workforce to minimize traffic and socioeconomic impacts. The Applicant performed in-depth analyses of over 10,000 acres of land in the Western Antelope Valley, as shown in DEIR Figure 6-1. Of the 10,000 acres screened, only ten percent met the criteria listed above.

The six Project sites selected and proposed by the Applicant are the most viable sites to develop solar electricity generation with minimal environmental impacts. These sites were also chosen for development based on interconnection capacity and requirements placed on the Applicant by the utility providers. Selection of other alternative sites would have the same or greater impacts

to the environment since the present Projects are the result of a long and intense effort by the Applicant to find and acquire the most suitable sites according to the criteria given above. **(DEIR at 1-6; 5-3)**. Furthermore, the environmental impacts for Projects 1-6 can all be mitigated to below a level of significance.

4.4 ALTERNATIVE 4: ROOFTOP SOLAR GENERATION

Description:

Under the Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative, solar photovoltaic panels would be installed on private rooftops.

Finding:

The Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative is rejected as infeasible, because the Project Applicant does not have the ability to install solar panels on private rooftops.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

For rooftop solar to be a viable alternative to the proposed Projects it would need to provide 172 MW of electricity into the local grid. Assuming one residential installation can produce 25 kilowatts of electricity, a total of 6,880 residential installations would be needed to produce 172 MW of electricity. The Applicant does not have the ability to install solar panels on private rooftops; therefore this alternative is not feasible for the Applicant. **(DEIR at 5-3)**.

4.5 ALTERNATIVE 5: WIND ENERGY GENERATION

Description:

Under the Wind Energy Generation Alternative, electricity would be generated through the use of wind turbines.

Finding:

The Wind Energy Generation Alternative is rejected as infeasible, because the type of geographical location that is suitable for a wind farm is not available within the vicinity.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

For wind energy generation to be a reasonable alternative to the proposed Projects and meet the purpose and need of the proposed Projects, it would need to provide 172 MW of electricity into the local grid; and to be sited on previously disturbed land that utilizes existing electrical distribution facilities, ROWs, roads, and other existing infrastructure where feasible to minimize the need for new electrical support facilities. The area required for construction and operation of a 172 MW wind farm would require a much more specific type of geographical location than the

Projects to provide adequate wind; a feasible project area of the nature required for wind electricity production is not readily available within the area of analysis for the proposed Projects. For this reason, this alternative is infeasible. **(DEIR at 5-3)**.

SECTION 5.0 FINDINDS REGARDING THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM ("MMRP")

Pursuant to Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code, the Commission, in adopting these Findings, also adopts the MMRP for the Silverado Power West Los Angeles Project. This Program is designed to ensure that, during Project implementation, the County and other responsible parties will comply with the mitigation measures adopted in these Findings.

The Commission hereby finds that the MMRP, which is incorporated herein by reference and attached as Exhibit A to these Findings, meets the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 by providing for the implementation and monitoring of Project conditions intended to mitigate potential environmental effects of the Project.

SECTION 6.0 CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15091 AND 15092 FINDINGS

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the administrative record, the Commission has made one or more of the following findings with respect to each of the significant effects of the Project:

A. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects on the environment.

B. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and such changes have been adopted by such other agency, or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the administrative record, and as conditioned by the foregoing:

A. All significant effects on the environment due to the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible.

SECTION 7.0 CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15084(D)(3) AND 15084(D)(4) FINDINGS

The County has relied on Sections 15084(d)(3) of the State CEQA guidelines, which allow acceptance of working drafts prepared by the Applicant, a consultant retained by the Applicant, or any other person. The County has also relied upon Section 15084(d)(4), which allows the Draft EIR to be prepared directly by, or under contract by the lead agency. The County has reviewed and edited as necessary the submitted drafts to reflect the County's own independent judgment, including reliance on County technical personnel from other departments.

SECTION 8.0 PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21082.1(C) FINDINGS

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(c), the Commission hereby finds that the lead agency has independently reviewed and analyzed the Final EIR, and that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency.

SECTION 9.0 NATURE OF FINDINGS

Any finding made by this Commission shall be deemed made, regardless of where it appears in this document. All of the language included in this document constitutes findings by this Commission, whether or not any particular sentence or clause includes a statement to that effect. This Commission intends that these Findings be considered as an integrated whole and, whether or not any part of these Findings fail to cross reference or incorporate by reference any other part of these findings, that any finding required or committed to be made by this Commission with respect to any particular subject matter of the Final EIR, shall be deemed to be made if it appears in any portion of these Findings.

SECTION 10.0 RELIANCE ON RECORD

Each and all of the findings and determinations contained herein are based on the competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire administrative record relating to the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project. The findings and determinations constitute the independent findings and determinations of this Commission in all respects, and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.

SECTION 11.0 RELATIONSHIP OF FINDINGS TO EIR

The County finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the EIR or is in the record of proceedings in the matter.

SECTION 12.0 CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS

The custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the County's decision is based is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning located at 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012.

EXHIBIT A
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
(“MMRP”)

CEQA requires a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for projects where mitigation measures are a condition of project approval and development. The Draft EIR prepared for the Silverado Power West, Los Angeles County Projects identified mitigation measures, where appropriate, to avoid or substantially reduce the environmental impacts associated with the Project. This MMRP is designed to monitor the implementation of those mitigation measures. Accordingly, this MMRP has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15097.

This section lists each of the proposed Project Design Features (PDFs) and required Mitigation Measures (MMs) and identifies the corresponding action required for proof of compliance, the mitigation timing, the party responsible for implementation, and the monitoring agency or party responsible for ensuring each measure is adequately implemented.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Silverado Power West, Los Angeles County Projects
Project Nos. R2011-00833, 00798, 00799, 00807, 00801, 00805
March 2014

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.1 AESTHETICS				
A-1 A Fugitive Dust Control Plan to minimize dust (visual pollution) shall be prepared and implemented.	A. Submit Plan to AVAQMD for review and approval	Prior to any ground disturbance activities	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP AVAQMD
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD
A-2 The Project site shall be maintained free of debris, trash, and waste during construction.	Site inspection	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP
A-3 The Project site shall be visually screened or partially screened during construction by fencing.	A. Submit Site Plans for review and approval	Prior to issuance of applicable building permit	Applicant	LACDRP
	B. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP
A-4 A landscape plan shall be developed for each Project prior to Project construction that shows the detail of a 10-foot wide screening vegetation buffer intended to screen or partially screen the Project visually from area residents or travelers on nearby roadways.	A. Submit landscape plan for review and approval. The landscape plan must be approved prior to grading or building permit.	Prior to 1st grading or building permit whichever comes first for each project.	Applicant	LACDRP/LACFD – support/referral Approval of landscape plan
	B. Implement approved landscape plan	Prior to first energization approval by LADPW B & S	Applicant	LACDRP/LACFD – support/referral Approval of landscape plan
A-5 All lighting shall comply with applicable provisions of the Los Angeles County Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Lights shall be limited to types allowed by the ordinance, installed below maximum allowed heights, pointed downwards and shielded to minimize light trespass, and mounted on essential infrastructure rather than on separate light poles	Submit final lighting plan for review and approval	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
except where poles are required by regulation or by governing agency. Lighting will comply with the hours of operation requirements in the ordinance, and utilize automatic control devices to comply with time limits except where permitted by Los Angeles County. Lighting will be maintained in good repair at all times.				
5.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY				
No mitigation measures are required for Agriculture and Forestry.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.3 AIR QUALITY				
AQ-1 Water active sites at least twice daily (locations where soil disturbance is to occur would be thoroughly watered before earthmoving) during construction.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVQMD
AQ-2 All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of CVC Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-3 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-4 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not be idle more than five minutes in any one hour.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-5 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operation of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-6 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-7 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.	Submit Transportation Demand Management program for review and approval	Prior to issuance of building permits	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPW support and referral for trip reduction determination

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
AQ-8 During array area preparation, mowing shall be used instead of grading and/or disking, and shall be limited to no more than 3.5 acres per day per site to further reduce dust emissions during construction.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-9 All interior roads shall use long-lasting non-toxic chemical soil stabilizers designed for long-term dust stabilization on dirt roads.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-10 Interior array areas shall have re-established pre-existing vegetation or be established with drought tolerant, native, or native compatible vegetation, to the greatest extent feasible, approved by the County biologist and compliant with Fire Department requirements, within two years of energization authorization of an array area by the Department of Public Works, Building and Safety Division, to provide long-term dust stabilization under the arrays.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Biologist	LACFD LACDRP
AQ-11 Earth disturbing activities shall be suspended and/or additional water shall be applied to meet Rule 403 criteria if wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP AVAQMD
AQ-12 Construction activity shall utilize electricity from power poles on or adjacent to the Project sites rather than use of temporary diesel power generators and/or gasoline power generators when electricity with adequate circuit capacity is available from power poles in proximity to construction areas.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-13 In the event temporary night lighting is necessary for construction or maintenance purposes, lighting not requiring the use of diesel or gasoline driven generators shall be used.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
B-1 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a qualified biologist shall be retained by the Applicant as the lead biological monitor subject to the approval of the LACDRP and CDFW. That person shall ensure that impacts to all biological resources are minimized or avoided, and shall conduct (or supervise) pre-grading field surveys for species that may be avoided, affected, or eliminated as a result of grading or any other site preparation activities. The lead biological monitor shall ensure that all surveys are conducted by qualified personnel (e.g. avian biologists for bird surveys, herpetologists for reptile surveys, etc.) and that they possess	A. Retain qualified Biologist(s)	Prior to issuance of Grading Permit	Applicant/Construction Monitor	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Field Surveys	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Maintain daily monitoring reports	During Construction	Applicant/Construction Monitor	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
all necessary permits and memoranda of understanding with the appropriate agencies for the handling of potentially-occurring special-status species. The lead biological monitor shall also ensure that daily monitoring reports (e.g., survey results, protective actions, results of protective actions, adaptive measures, etc.) are prepared, and shall make these monitoring reports available to DRP and CDFW at their request.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-2 Pre-Construction surveys will be conducted prior to ground disturbance at each project site. These surveys will include all special-status species identified as having the potential to be present on the project site; including, but not limited to, badger, kit fox, southern grasshopper mouse, and the species listed below. • Pre-survey information gathering will include reviewing of all available agency nest data and mapping. • A focused pre-construction Swainson's hawk survey shall be conducted to locate any nesting sites within 5 miles of Projects 1 – 6. If Swainson's hawks or their active nests are located within 500 feet of the project sites, all construction-related work shall be postponed and CDFW will be consulted. • Project-related activities likely to have the potential of disturbing suitable bird nesting habitat, which includes ground nesting birds, shall be prohibited from February 1 through August 31, unless a qualified monitoring biologist conducts nesting bird surveys prior to any construction-related disturbance to confirm the absence of active bird nests or bird nesting habitat. Disturbance shall be defined as any activity that physically removes or damages vegetation or habitat or any action that may cause disruption of nesting behavior such as loud noise from equipment or artificial night lighting. Surveys shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. If an active bird nest is discovered, disturbance within 500 feet for raptors shall be postponed until the nest is vacated, offspring are independent of the nest area and there is no evidence of further attempts at nesting. Limits of avoidance shall be marked with high-visibility flagging or fencing. The Applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures and submit the records to LACDRP and CDFW to document compliance with applicable state and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds. • A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted on each site prior to grading. Pre-construction surveys for burrowing owl shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to	Pre-construction surveys for special-status species that have been identified as having potential to occur on site	Prior to grading or as specified per species	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
the commencement of disturbance. The surveys shall follow the protocols set forth by the California Burrowing Owl Consortium (1993 and 2012). If burrowing owls are found during the pre-construction survey, then replacement burrows and habitat must be provided prior to the commencement of construction. The Applicant shall be prepared to provide artificial replacement burrows in the event that owls are detected, either as wintering or breeding individuals. Wintering individuals may be evicted with the use of exclusion devices followed by a period of seven days to ensure that animals have left their burrows. When it can be assured that owls are no longer using the burrows, the burrows can be hand excavated and collapsed under the supervision of the avian biologist. Breeding owls must not be disturbed and must be allowed to complete the raising of young until the fledglings can forage independently of adults and it can be confirmed that further attempts at nesting shall not be undertaken. When this has been confirmed, the owls can be evicted as described above for wintering animals. • Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for special-status ground-dwelling reptiles, including but not limited to coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard. Surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground 4 to 6 weeks in advance of the survey effort, checking weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles or other species determined important by the qualified biological monitor (i.e., biologist must be appropriately permitted for collection and relocation activities) occurring within the work area prior to the start of work shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.				
B-3 During grading, earthmoving activities, and other construction activities the biological monitor shall be present to inspect and enforce all mitigation requirements and to relocate any species that may come into harm's way to an appropriate offsite location of similar habitat. The biological monitor shall be authorized to stop specific grading or	Biological Monitoring	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
construction activities if violations of mitigation measures or any local, state, or federal laws are suspected. The biological monitor shall file a report of the monitoring activities with LACDRP and CDFW. If ongoing biological monitoring of construction activities reveals the presence of any special-status reptiles within an active work area, then work shall be temporarily halted until the animals can be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones. Work areas shall be surveyed for special-status reptile species, such as the coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard, during construction activities. During the construction, surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground in appropriate work areas and checking them weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles occurring within the work area shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-4 Mitigation lands shall be acquired for Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, special-status migratory and wintering birds, and alkali mariposa lily. <u>Swainson's hawk</u>: Impacts due to development of the projects shall be mitigated by the acquisition of good quality Swainson's hawk habitat targeted within the Antelope Valley. Land shall be purchased or placed in a conservation easement or other suitable deed restriction and managed to maintain suitable habitat in perpetuity. The proposed development is not expected to result in the "take" of Swainson's hawk; however, the Applicant shall be required to consult CDFW in the event of take, which may result in additional mitigation prescribed by CDFW. Although the Projects are not expected to result in "take" of Swainson's hawk, mitigation will still be required to alleviate the effects of cumulative impacts on raptor, migratory bird, and burrowing owl habitats: Replacement land will be provided based on the quality of the mitigation land relative to the impacted habitat. The ratio of such replacement shall be determined as follows: • A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 3 acres of development if the replacement land is superior nesting and foraging habitat contiguous to occupied nesting and foraging habitat, and is within a designated or proposed Significant Ecological Area (SEA). • A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 2 acres of development if the replacement land is unoccupied irrigated land, contiguous to occupied habitat and providing superior quality foraging habitat with trees or other such nesting habitat; • A ratio of 1 acre of replacement land for each acre of development if the replacement land provides similar foraging and nesting habitat. <u>Burrowing Owl</u>: Mitigation for any occupied burrowing owl burrows found during pre-construction surveys will include a comprehensive tiered approach: • Pre-construction and construction monitoring surveys conducted by a qualified biologist to detect potential new owl activity onsite;	A. Acquire mitigation lands for Swainson's Hawk	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Acquire mitigation lands for Burrowing Owl	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Pre-construction survey for Alkali Mariposa Lilies	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	D. If necessary Acquire Alkali Mariposa Mitigation land	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
• Disturbance avoidance of occupied burrows during nesting period February 1 – August 31; • Impact avoidance of occupied burrows; • Burrow exclusion and closure and offsite relocation (>100 m), as described previously in in B-2, will be conducted for unavoidable impacts to occupied burrows (after consultation with CDFW). • Minimizing impacts by protecting in-place any owls, their burrows, and their immediate habitat by establishing setback zones and visual screens for burrows adjacent to construction activity; by placing visible markers, and by conducting construction worker awareness training. Setback widths will be applied as appropriate to the level of existing disturbance and owl stage of activity (e.g., for low to moderate construction-related disturbance activity outside the nesting season near burrows in currently high-traffic or disturbance areas, it is assumed owls are adapted to human disturbance and will not need a large setback). • Mitigating unavoidable impacts to habitat: restore temporary impacts to pre-existing conditions; replace nesting/occupied and satellite burrows lost with the same number of suitable burrows on the mitigation site. Mitigation acreage for foraging habitat provided for Swainson's hawk will be sufficient to replace lost burrowing owl habitat because the hawk's replacement habitat will be in-kind or better (i.e., the Project habitat is low quality overall and mitigation habitat will be at least the same quality as the lost habitat OR will have higher quality habitat features overall, such as increased vegetative structure, higher numbers of prey species, less disturbance, and less potential for predation by domestic animals, etc.). Specific habitat considerations as provided in the CDFW 2012 burrowing owl guidance will be considered in selecting the overall habitat replacement acres for the project. <u>Alkali Mariposa Lily</u>: Alkali mariposa lily will be avoided to the greatest extent possible. If pre-construction surveys reveal individuals that cannot be avoided, mitigation of lost alkali mariposa lily shall be provided at a minimum 1:1 ratio. This acreage will be calculated with input from LACDRP and CDFW. Additionally, because alkali mariposa Lilies have locally available seed sources, plantings of the lilies on				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
appropriate soil types on Projects shall be implemented in selected areas. The lilies may also be transplanted from areas planned for disturbance to more suitable locations in the Project area. Transplantation locations must be situated within adequately buffered areas to be found suitable. For all species the mitigation acreage may be located within the Project sites, but outside of the area of development, subject to LACDRP and CDFW approval, if acreage of sufficient quantity and quality exists.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-5 Review and Approval of Habitat Management Lands Prior to Acquisition: The Applicant shall provide a mitigation land acquisition proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for their approval before acquiring the property. The proposal shall discuss the suitability of the property by comparing it to the selection criteria. As a part of the preparation of the land acquisition proposal, acreage quantification by habitat category will be developed with LACDRP and CDFW based on the following criteria: <u>Habitat Management Land Selection Criteria</u>: The Applicant must identify the region within which lands shall be acquired, and the type and quality of habitat to be acquired. Detailed criteria and acreage for each habitat category will be developed with Los Angeles County and CDFW. Foraging habitat shall be assessed as moderate to good with a capacity to improve in quality and value to Swainson's hawks, and must be within the Antelope Valley Swainson's hawk breeding range. Foraging habitat with suitable nest trees is preferred. <u>Habitat Management Lands Acquisition</u>: Prior to initiating ground-disturbing activities, the Applicant shall provide a proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for off-site mitigation land to be restored, enhanced, or maintained according to the requirements of the biological mitigation measures in this EIR. The proposal will require that mitigation lands identified shall be preserved as open space in perpetuity. Within 45 days of acquiring the mitigation land(s), the Applicant shall record a permanent deed restriction on the mitigation land(s) to be preserved as open space. The deed restriction or conservation easement language shall be submitted to LACDRP and CDFW for review and approval prior to recordation. Alternatively, should a conservation easement on the mitigation land be offered, the permanent conservation easement shall be recorded to the satisfaction of LACDRP and CDFW. The Applicant shall establish a fund sufficient for the restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation land(s) until such time when the mitigation land(s) become self-sustaining and until such time as the mitigation land(s) meet the requirements of this mitigation measure. The fund shall be established within 90 days of mitigation land(s)	A. Obtain approval of habitat management lands	Prior to Acquisition	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Record a permanent deed restriction or conservation easement on mitigation land(s)	Within 45 days of acquiring land(s)	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Establish fund in the amount acceptable to LACDRP and CDFW for restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation lands	Within 90-days of mitigation land(s) acquisition	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
acquisition in an amount acceptable to the LACDRP and CDFW.				
Land Acquisition Schedule and Financial Assurances: The Applicant shall complete acquisition, or execute an irrevocable option to purchase, of proposed Habitat Management lands and shall provide financial assurances for dedicating adequate funding for impact avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, if necessary, prior to the issuance of building permits. If an irrevocable option to purchase is utilized, the applicant shall provide a proposed date of purchase which coincides with construction of the facility.				
B-6 Prior to alteration of any streambeds, the Applicant shall enter into an agreement with the CDFW, pursuant to Sections 1601 through 1603 of the State Fish and Game Code.	Enter into an agreement with CDFW pursuant to sections 1601 through 1603	Prior to alteration of Streambed	Applicant	CDFW
B-7 Within all interior portions of the site within and adjacent to the proposed solar arrays, re-vegetation shall be accomplished (excluding interior roads as follows: Vegetation seeded in these areas shall comprise locally-sourced, native species if available, or, native compatible as approved by the County biologist if sufficient locally-sourced native seed stock not available, approximating low-growing communities such as native perennial or annual grasslands (i.e., wildflower fields). Shrub species shall not be used due to these species inability to survive continued vegetation trimming. Vegetation shall be maintained in accordance with Los Angeles County Fire Department regulations.	Revegetation of interior site, excluding interior roads	After construction	Applicant	LACDRP
5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES				
CUL-1 In the event cultural resources are encountered during construction of the Projects, all ground-disturbing activities within the vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall be notified of the find. The archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American Monirot shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to recordation and excavation of the finds and evaluation and processing of the finds in accordance with § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Potentially significant cultural resources	A. Archaeological monitoring and Native American monitor when there is a find	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP NAHC
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Site inspection as needed	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
consist of, but are not limited to, stone, bone, fossils, wood or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resources are determined to be unique historic resources as defined under § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, Mitigation Measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate Mitigation Measures for significant resources could include but not be limited to avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. No further earthwork shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any archaeological artifacts recovered because of mitigation will be donated to a qualified scientific institution approved by the Lead Agency where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.			Archaeologist	
CUL-2 In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, California State Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 dictates that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to CEQA regulations and PRC § 5097.98. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.	A. Archaeological and Native American monitoring	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist/NAHC representative	LACDRP NAHC
	B. Maintain documentation demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-3 Project 4 construction of gen-tie lines shall maintain the right of way buffer zones prescribed by SCE for this historic electric transmission line resource, which is an active transmission line. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-4 Project construction for Project 4 shall maintain a one acre undisturbed area surrounding the Del Sur Cemetery	A. Submit pre-construction surveys	Prior to construction	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
site. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	B. Construction monitoring by qualified Archaeologist	During construction	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Submit construction monitoring documentation	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	D. Site inspection as needed	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-5 A County approved archaeologist will be retained to initiate and supervise cultural resource monitoring during Project related earthwork in areas of the Project that are within 50 feet from certain significant cultural resources, specifically from the defined perimeter of site CA-LAN-1579H (Project 4). If resources are identified, the procedures outlined in CUL-1 will be followed and/or CUL-2 (as necessary). This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	A. Archaeological monitoring	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
PALEO-1: A qualified paleontologist shall be retained by the Applicant prior to excavations reaching 10 feet in depth or greater. A The paleontologist shall develop and execute a Paleontological Resource Mitigation and Monitoring Program and supervise a paleontological monitor whom shall monitor all ground-disturbing activities associated with such excavations. The Program will outline the procedures to follow in regards to paleontological resources (e.g. monitoring protocols, curation, data recovery of fossils, reporting). If fossils are found during such excavation, the paleontological monitor shall be authorized to halt ground-disturbing activities within 25 feet of the find in order to allow evaluation of the find and determination of appropriate treatment according to the Program.	Paleontological Monitoring	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Paleontologist	LACDRP LAC Natural History Museum support/referral
5.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
No mitigation measures are required for Geology and Soils.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS				
GHG-1 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment	A. Submit operating permit(s) as required	Prior to commencement of construction	Applicant	AVAQMD LACDRP
	B. Maintain log	During construction	Applicant/Construction	AVAQMD

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.	demonstrating compliance		Manager	LACDRP
GHG-2 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not be idle more than five minutes in any one hour.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-3 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have proper training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operations of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-4 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 mph or less.	Site inspection as needed	During construction and grading	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-5 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	Prior to Building Permit	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.8 HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS WASTES				
HH-1 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Materials Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.	Submit Hazardous Materials Management Plan	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC
HH-2 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.	Submit Hazardous Waste Management Plan for each Project	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC
HH-3 Prior to the start of construction activities on the parcel containing the historic UST at the location of Project 1, a Phase I ESA will be completed. This mitigation measure only applies to Project 1.	Phase I ESA	Prior to issuance of grading permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP
HH-4 Prior to the start of construction activities, a closure permit for the UST will be verified or obtained from the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Health Hazardous Materials Division. This mitigation measure only applies to Project 1.	Closure permit or verification for UST – Project 1 site	Prior to issuance of grading permit(s)	Applicant	LACFD
HH-5 Construction activities shall be halted if previously unidentified soil contamination is observed or indicated by testing during any earthwork activities. Construction will be halted or redirected until such soil contamination is evaluated and disposed of and/or treated	Testing of soil contamination	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC LACDRP
5.9 HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY				
Construction				
HYDRO-1 Education and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants and Employees. Appropriate educational materials and training for preventing stormwater pollution and additional BMP Fact Sheets from the California Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks can be found at www.cabmphandbooks.com. Practical information material will be provided to employees on general good housekeeping practices. These materials will describe, but are not limited to, spill prevention and control and the use of chemicals, petroleum products, pesticides and fertilizers that should be limited to the property, with no discharge of wastes directly or indirectly to gutters, catch basins or the storm drain system. Information will be distributed directly to the employees as well as being posted in public areas. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities. The required materials shall be	Maintain log demonstrating compliance of Educational materials and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants, and Employee	During Construction	Applicant	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
available at each project site and a log kept to show education has occurred prior to the start of construction.				
HYDRO-2 A spill contingency plan will be prepared by the owner/building operator. As a minimum the Spill Contingency Plan will "mandate the stockpiling of cleanup materials, notification of responsible agencies, disposal of cleanup materials and documentation." This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Submit spill contingency plan	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACDRP
HYDRO-3 No hazardous materials are anticipated to be stored on-site. If deemed otherwise, a designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in accordance with requirements of the Health & Safety Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction and operations	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACFD
HYDRO-4 A designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in compliance of the current requirements of the County of Los Angeles Fire Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Submit all applicable information	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACFD
Operation				
HYDRO-5 Site waste receptacles shall be emptied on a weekly basis or more often if containers approach overflowing. Upon inspection any debris or rubbish will be picked up and the site cleaned. The trash area/room is NOT to be cleaned by hosing down. The type of materials used to clean the area and storage of said materials will be determined by the Contractor. Signage will be posted that lids shall be kept closed at all times. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 at all times during facility operations.	A. Include waste collection and disposal methods in construction contract specifications	During operation	Applicant	LACSD LACDRP
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During operation	Applicant	LACSD LACDRP
5.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING				
No mitigation measures are required for Land Use and Planning	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.11 NOISE				
N-1 Construction operations would not occur between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday, or at any time on Sunday with the exception of limited low-noise	Maintain log of construction equipment arrivals and exit times demonstrating	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
generating potential night work with Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning and Public Works approval.	compliance			
N-2 Construction site and access road maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour shall be established and enforced during the construction period.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-3 Electrically-powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, except for devices like trucks, loaders, dozers, and other heavy equipment.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-4 Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far as practicable, and no closer than 1,000 feet, from noise-sensitive receptors.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
	B. Inclusion of requirement for a Noise Control Plan	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
N-5 The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells are prohibited except where required by OSHA or for safety or emergency warning purposes required by other regulatory agencies.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-6 Project-related public address or music systems used on-site shall not be audible at any adjacent receptor.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
N-7 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 which are in compliance with any applicable legally required equipment noise standards. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors) shall be equipped with shrouds and/or other noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment. Mobile sound barriers with a sound transmission class of 19 or greater will be used for pile driving on Projects where received sound levels at the nearest NSR are predicted to be above the County construction noise limit of 60 dBA during the day.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
	B. Site inspection as needed	During Construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including: **N-8** Siting substations to achieve NEMA sound ratings at sensitive receptors as described in Section 4.11.5.2 not to be closer to the property line of sensitive receptors than the following distances for each individual project: • Project 1 – 325 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 74 dBA • Project 2 – 1,511 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 81 dBA • Project 3 – 650 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 74 dBA • Project 4 (two transformers) – 1,000 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 77 dBA • Project 5 – 748 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 82 dBA	A. Submit acoustical report demonstrating substation design compliance with applicable noise standards	Prior to issuance of relevant building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer
	B. Construct structures in compliance with noise limit requirements of applicable County codes.	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH
	C. Submit post-construction noise measurements verifying compliance upon request	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support/referral
With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including: **N-9** The Applicant shall choose to use NEMA low noise rated transformer equipment which will achieve 10 dBA or greater noise reduction as compared to standard NEMA-rated transformers of a similar size and rated capacity to ensure that Project noise impacts would be less than significant.	A. Submit acoustical report demonstrating substation design compliance with applicable noise standards	Prior to issuance of relevant building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer
	B. Construct structures in compliance with noise limit requirements of applicable County codes.	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH
	C. Submit post-construction noise measurements verifying compliance upon request	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support/referral
5.12 PUBLIC SERVICES				
No mitigation measures are required for Public Services	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.13 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC				
TT-1 Prior to issuance of first grading or building permit, Applicant shall document and submit all required information	Submit Projects' road survey	Prior to issuance of first grading or building	Applicant	LACDPW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
and/or material pertaining to the pavement conditions of construction routes for the Projects, including the formula for calculation of the Projects' fair share of any repair or reconstruction of construction routes to the satisfaction of LACDPW. Applicant shall reimburse the County of Los Angeles for the cost of any repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes attributable to the Projects as agreed to by LACDPW. The timing of any necessary repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes and the required payment by the Applicant shall be determined by LACDPW.		permit		
TT-2 The County, including LACFD Fire Stations 78 (for R2011-00801) and 130 (for R2011-00798, 00799, 00805,00807, & 00833) shall be notified at least three days in advance of any street closures that may affect fire and/or paramedic responses in the area. The Applicant shall provide alternate route (detour) plans to the County, including three sets to LACFD, with a tentative schedule of planned closures, prior to the beginning of construction.	Provide street closure notifications	Three days prior to any street closures impacting fire and/or paramedics	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACFD
TT-3 Stagger construction work shifts before or after peak traffic hours.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support referral Caltrans
	B. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support referral Caltrans
TT-4 Schedule truck deliveries during off peak hours.	Maintain log of truck arrivals and exit times demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
TT-5 Limit water truck deliveries during the AM peak hour to 30 percent of the daily water truck trips.	Maintain log of truck arrivals and exit times demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
TT-6 Encourage carpooling between construction works.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
5.14 UTILITIES				
No mitigation measures are required for Utilities.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
List of Acronyms: B & S – building and safety BMP – Best Management Practice CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act CASQA – California Association of Stormwater Quality Agencies CBC – California Building Code CDFW – California Department of Fish and Wildlife CUP – Conditional Use Permit CVC – California Vehicle Code dBA – decibels (acoustics) DPR – Department of Parks and Recreation ESA – Environmental Site Assessment hp – Horsepower LACDPW – Los Angeles County Department of Public Works LACFD – Los Angeles County Fire Department mph – miles per hour NEMA – National Electrical Manufacturers Association OSHA – Occupational Safety and Health Administration PRC – Public Resources Code ROW – Right of Way SCE – Southern California Edison SWPPP – Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan UFC – Uniform Fire Code UST – Underground Storage Tank WATCH – Work Area Traffic Control Handbook LACDPH – Los Angeles County Department of Public Health LACSD – Los Angeles County Sanitation District				

FINDINGS OF FACT REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

FOR THE SILVERADO POWER WEST LOS ANGELES COUNTY PROJECT

PROJECT SITE NO. 4 (Antelope Solar Greenworks)

COUNTY PROJECT NO. R2011-00807-(5)

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 201100076

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 201100109

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2012061068

PROJECT FINDINGS ORGANIZATION

Section 1	Introduction
Section 2	Findings Regarding Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Have Been Mitigated to a Less than Significant Level
Section 3	Findings Regarding Cumulative Environmental Effects Which are Not Significant or Which Have Been Mitigated to a Less Than Significant Level
Section 4	Findings Regarding Project Alternatives
Section 5	Findings Regarding the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Section 6	CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 and 15092 Findings
Section 7	CEQA Guidelines Section 15084(D)(3) and 15084(D)(4) Findings
Section 8	Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(C) Findings
Section 9	Nature of Findings
Section 10	Reliance on Record
Section 11	Relationship of Findings to EIR
Section 12	Custodian of Records
Exhibit A	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP")

SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The County of Los Angeles ("County") Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") hereby certifies and finds that the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County ("Project") Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR"), State Clearinghouse Number 2012061068, has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq., "CEQA") and the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Cal. Code Regs. Sections 15000 et seq., "CEQA Guidelines").

The Project Final EIR consists of the following documents: (1) December 2013 Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR" or "DEIR"); (2) December 2013 Technical Appendices to the Draft EIR; and (3) March 2014 Final EIR.

The Commission hereby further certifies that it received, reviewed and considered the information contained in the following: (i) the Final EIR; (ii) the application for Conditional Use Permit No. 201100076; and (iii) all hearings, and submissions of testimony from County officials and departments, the Applicant (as defined herein), the public, other public agencies, community groups, and organizations.

Concurrently with the adoption of these findings, the Commission adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP"), attached hereto as Exhibit A. Having received, reviewed and considered the foregoing information, as well as any and all information in the administrative record and the record of proceedings, the Commission hereby makes the following Findings of Fact ("Findings") pursuant to and in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15090:

SECTION 1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

1.1.1 Project Location.

The Project site is located in the northern portion of unincorporated Los Angeles County. The EIR analyzed a total of six (6) individual Project sites (collectively, "Projects" or "Projects 1-6"), which will each be subject to separate review and approval by the County.[1]

These Findings specifically pertain to "Project 4", which is approximately 256 acres and located at 97th Street West and West Avenue I, in Lancaster, California. The Assessor's Parcel Numbers ("APNs") for Project 4 are 3218-002-018, 3218-002-023, 3203-002-015, 3203-002-017, 3218-001-002, 3218-001-003, 3218-001-004, 3203-002-011, 3203-002-012, 3203-002-013, 3203-002-014, and 3219-019-011. When complete, Project 4 would produce 52 megawatts ("MW") of electricity from solar photovoltaic modules.

[1] The six individual Projects are not dependent upon each other for success. Each Project can succeed as a stand-alone project if other projects are not approved by Los Angeles County or if technical or financial problems delay or block the completion of a Project. CEQA allows for a group of projects to be analyzed as a single EIR; each Project must also receive approval of its CUP application and other entitlements on the merits of the individual Project and individual site.

1.1.2 Project Description—Features Common to Projects 1 - 6.

There are certain general Project characteristics and features that will apply to each of the individual six Project sites, including Project 4, as follows:

All six of the Projects would be designed and built using the same or similar methods and would have similar Project characteristics. The Projects would utilize photovoltaic ("PV") technology on fixed-tilt or tracker mounting supports. The proposed PV Projects would be constructed in phases and operated for an estimated 35 years. Construction would generally take place during normal daylight hours and would conform to County construction requirements.

Each Project would consist of the following elements:

- PV modules;
- PV module mounting system;
- Balance of system and electrical boxes (e.g., combiner boxes, electrical disconnects);
- Substation (Projects 1 – 5);
- Electrical inverters and transformers;
- Electrical AC collection system, including switchgear;
- Data monitoring equipment;
- Generation tie line; and
- Access roads and chain link perimeter security fencing.

<u>Solar PV Generating Facilities</u>

The Solar Generating Facilities ("SGFs") are designed for optimum performance and ease of maintenance. The Projects would consist of a series of PV module arrays mounted on racking systems, which are typically supported by a pile-driven foundation design. The foundation design would be determined based on the full geotechnical survey. The module mounting system, or racking system, would have a fixed-tilt or tracker PV array configuration and would be oriented south to maximize the amount of incident solar radiation absorbed over the course of the year. Electricity from a series of PV arrays would be funneled and combined at combiner boxes located throughout the SGF. The electrical current would then be further collected and combined prior to feeding the inverters. The SGF would be laid out in a PV block design to allow adequate area for maintenance in the way of clearances or access roads.

Inverters would be consolidated in areas to minimize cable routing and trenching and ensure minimal electrical losses. The alternating current ("AC") from the inverters would be routed through an AC collection system and consolidated within system switchgear. The final output from the SGF would be processed through a transformer to match the interconnection voltage. Electrical safety and protection systems would be provided to meet utility, International Organization for Standardization, and regulatory codes and standards. The energy would be

delivered to the regional electrical distribution network. A security perimeter fence with appropriate signage for public protection would be installed. Points of ingress/egress would be accessed by locked gates for facility services and maintenance.

Photovoltaic Modules

The SGFs would require installation of PV modules. The total number of PV modules required would depend on the technology selected, optimization evaluation, and detailed design. The market conditions, economic considerations, and the environmental factors would be taken into account during the detail design process. The following PV module technologies or equivalent are being considered for incorporation into the Projects:

- PV thin-film technology
- PV crystalline silicon technology
- Fixed-tilt configuration; and
- Tracking design configuration.

The modules configured with a fixed tilt would be oriented toward the south and angled at a degree that would optimize solar resource efficiency. For the tracking configuration, the modules would rotate from east to west over the course of the day. Modules would be non-reflective and highly absorptive.

Standard Installation, Array Assembly, and Racking

The final racking system would be determined by optimization evaluations and economic assessments and incorporated into the detailed design. Likewise, the final foundation design would be determined based on the geotechnical survey for each of the PV Project locations. Once the foundation has been installed, the module mounting system would be installed on it. For a tracking configuration, motors would be installed to drive the tracking mechanism. The PV modules would be delivered to each site during construction to support the installation schedule. The module mounting system would be oriented in rows within a PV design block, presenting a standard and uniform appearance across the facility. The panel configuration would be uniform in height and width.

Collection, Inverters, AC Collection, and Transformers

Modules would be electrically connected into strings. Each string would be funneled by electrical conduit (typically underground) wiring to combiner boxes located throughout the solar field power blocks. The output power cables from the combiner boxes would be again consolidated and feed the direct current ("DC") electricity to inverters, which convert the DC to AC. Underground electrical cables would be installed using ordinary trenching techniques, which include excavation of trenches to accommodate conduits. Wire depth and trench backfill would be in accordance with local, state, and federal codes.

The AC energy would be stepped up to the appropriate interconnection voltage by system transformers to match the voltage at the grid interconnection. As required, switchgear cabinetry

would be provided where necessary for circuit control. All electrical inverters, transformers, and gear would be placed on concrete foundation structures.

Commissioning of equipment would include testing, calibration of equipment, and troubleshooting. All electrical equipment, inverters, collector system, and PV array systems would be tested prior to commencement of commercial operations.

Substations

For Projects 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, which require substations, the area for the substations would be appropriately graded and excavated to accommodate transformer equipment, the control building foundation, and oil containment area. Foundations for equipment within each approximately 1-acre substation would be constructed with reinforced concrete.

Structural components in the Project substation area would include:

- Transformers, switchgear, and safety systems; and
- Footings and oil containment system for transformers.

Interconnection Descriptions

Each inverter would be fully enclosed and pad mounted and would be approximately 90 inches in height. The AC output of two inverters would be fed via underground cable into the low-voltage side of the inverter step-up transformer, generally within 20 feet of the inverters. Each transformer would be mounted on a concrete pad and enclosed together with switchgear and a junction box. Transformers are typically 87 inches in height. The high-voltage output of the transformer would be combined in series via underground collector cables to the junction box of the nearest transformer, ranging from as little as 60 feet to as much as 700 feet. The collector system cables would be tied throughout the SGF at underground junction boxes to the main underground collector cables, which would be composed of a larger wire gauge, to the location of the generator step-up transformer ("GSU"), as applicable at each Project location. The main collector cables would rise into the low-voltage busbar and protection equipment that would be enclosed together with the GSU. The primary switchgear includes the main circuit breaker and utility metering equipment, and it would be enclosed separately but pad-mounted together with the GSU. Both the GSU and the primary switchgear would stand approximately 87 inches in height.

The output of the switchgear would be the start of the Project generation tie ("gen-tie") line. The connections from the SGFs to the regional transmission lines are made through the construction of gen-tie lines. Los Angeles County requires that all gen-tie lines be underground except when other applicable regulations require otherwise, and Projects 1 − 6 are each designed in this manner. Each gen-tie line would consist of three phases of either underground or overhead conductor and a disconnect switch. The overhead conductor would be mounted on either wooden or tubular steel poles of varying heights ranging from 55 to 85 feet. Pole height would be determined by the span between poles as defined in the final design for each Project.

Data Collection Systems

Each Project would be designed with a comprehensive Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition ("SCADA") system for remote monitoring of facility operation and/or remote control of critical components. Within the site, the fiber optic or other cabling required for the monitoring system, would be installed with the gathering line system throughout the solar field leading to a centrally located (or series of appropriately located) SCADA system cabinets. The external telecommunications connections to the SCADA system cabinets may be through either wireless or hard-wired telecommunications to a centralized data collection center.

The system would also include a permanent meteorological data collection system. The station would have several weather sensors: a pyranometer for measuring solar irradiance, a thermometer to measure air temperature, a barometric pressure sensor, and two wind sensors to measure speed and direction. These sensors would be connected to a data logger, which would compile the data for transmission to the data collection center.

Construction

Construction for each of the six Project facilities consists of three major phases: (1) site preparation, (2) PV system installation testing and startup, and (3) site cleanup/restoration. Best Management Practices ("BMPs") would be required during all construction phases of the Projects. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP") incorporating BMPs for erosion control would be prepared and approved before the start of construction. The Projects would also comply with applicable post-construction water quality standards adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board ("RWQCB").

PV System Installation

PV system installation includes earthwork, grading, and erosion control, as well as construction of the plant substation and erection of the PV modules, supports, and associated electrical equipment. System installation would begin with teams installing the steel/concrete piers support structures. The exact design would be finalized pending evaluation of soil conditions.

The proposed method of installation would be the use of vibration-driven pile foundations. This step would be followed by panel installation and electrical work. A very limited volume of concrete would be required for the substation footings, foundations, pads for the transformers, and other substation equipment. Silverado Power, LLC ("Applicant") does not propose to use excavated and poured footings or foundations for the PV arrays. Concrete would be produced at an off-site location by a local provider and transported to the Project sites by truck.

The enclosures housing the inverters have a pre-cast concrete base. Final concrete specifications would be determined during detailed design engineering consistent with applicable building codes. The primary site preparation method for the PV modules would be mowing, because the majority of the six sites are very flat with little change in topography. However, there may be a few instances where limited earthwork, including ponding area leveling of less than one foot in depth, and erosion control cultivation may be required to accommodate the placement of PV arrays. Other than required grading for roads, pads, and drainage features, and standard

trenching and installation work, no other earthwork would be performed within the array areas. Erosion control techniques used during construction may include the use of silt fencing, straw bales, temporary catch basins, inlet filters, and truck tire muck shakers. Construction of the PV arrays includes the installation of support beams, module rail assemblies, PV modules, inverters, transformers, and buried electrical cables.

Wastes generated during construction may include the following: cardboard, wood pallets, copper wire, scrap steel, common trash, and wood wire spools. The Applicant does not expect to generate hazardous waste during construction. However, field equipment used during construction would contain various hazardous materials such as hydraulic oil, diesel fuel, grease, lubricants, solvents, adhesives, paints, and other petroleum-based products contained in construction vehicles.

Operations & Maintenance

Upon commissioning, the Projects would enter the operational phase. For the duration of the operational phase, the Projects would be operated and monitored remotely by a third party contractor, with an assumed two on-site visits for security, maintenance, and system monitoring per quarter (total of eight trips per year) by two third party employees in one light duty truck, and two on-site visits by four third party employees for biannual panel washing that includes one light duty truck and one water truck. Therefore the trips would be no more than 10 trips annually for security, maintenance, system monitoring and panel washing. There would be no personnel stationed on-site full time during operations. The PV arrays would produce electricity passively with minimal moving parts; therefore, maintenance requirements would be limited. Any required planned maintenance would be scheduled to avoid peak-load periods, and unplanned maintenance would typically be responded to as needed depending on the event.

Security

To ensure the safety of the public and the facilities, the sites would be fenced and signs would be posted. Security measures would be installed as necessary to mitigate and/or deter unauthorized access. Access to the sites would be controlled and gates would be installed at the roads entering the property.

Decommissioning Plan

A Decommissioning Plan for each of the Projects would be prepared and submitted for approval to Los Angeles County prior to obtaining a grading permit. The plan would assure that the land is protected during operations and returned as closely as possible to its original state upon termination of the use of the land as a SGF. It is unknown at this time if solar energy electricity production would continue to be utilized on this land in excess of 35 years, and thus the future long-term use of the site beyond 35 years is unknown. The life of each facility is presently proposed to be 35 years. The Decommissioning Plan would be implemented in the early summer of the year or year following the time of facility closure thus allowing the site reclamation to be completed outside of the rainy season and before winter begins. In the event that a Project ceases

operations prior to completion of the 35-year estimated life of the Project, applicable provisions of the Decommissioning Plan would commence.

Section 1.1.3 Project Description—Features Unique to Project Site 4

Project 4 (Antelope Solar Greenworks) would have a generating capacity of 52 MW-AC and would be located on 256 acres of primarily unproductive agricultural land in unincorporated northern Los Angeles County. Project 4 would operate year-round, producing electric power during daytime hours.

The power generated by Project 4 would interconnect to the existing SCE transmission and distribution lines with the voltage transformation equipment and system safety equipment constructed on the site. Project 4 would have four separate points of interconnection ("POI"). For the first POI, the gen-tie line would cross West Avenue J underground to the SCE 66 kV transmission line running east-west on the south side of the road. The second POI would be reached by the gen-tie line crossing 90th Street West underground to the SCE 12.47 kV distribution line running north-south on the east side of the road. The third POI gen-tie line would connect to the existing SCE 66 kV transmission line located on-site near the NE corner of 97th Street West and Lancaster Boulevard. The fourth POI would tie into the existing SCE 12.47 kV distribution line located adjacent to the Project 4 site on the north side of West Avenue I.

Project 4 Telecommunications Lines

The primary telecommunication method for Project 4 is expected to be direct fiber optic cables placed overhead or underground along the path of the gen-tie line within the public ROW or located on private land, extending from the Project 4 site to existing or proposed telecommunication infrastructure. A dedicated broadband connection from a local provider will be secured at the site.

Project 4 Construction

Project 4 would be constructed in two phases. Construction of the site, beginning with site preparation and grading through equipment setup and commencement of commercial operation, is expected to last approximately four months for Phase 1 and nine months for Phase 2, with Project 4 being commercially operational by the end of the fourth quarter of 2014. The on-site workforce would consist of laborers, electricians, supervisory personnel, support personnel, and construction management personnel. Construction would generally occur during daylight hours, Monday through Friday. Construction activities would be conducted consistent with Los Angeles County regulations regarding hours of construction. Project 4 is expected to create 160 new jobs at peak crew size during the construction phase.

The expected construction water use for the Project is 155 acre feet, which would be trucked to this site from a private provider of out-of-Basin or other authorized water. Construction water needs would be limited to soil conditioning and dust suppression. Potable water would be brought to the Project 4 site for drinking and domestic needs.

Project 4 Operations

No personnel would be stationed at the facility, and no occupied structures would be built on the site. Full and part-time positions over the life of the Project would be required for periodic operation and maintenance activities, and would be performed by a third-party contractor. Operational water requirements for Project 4 would be 7.6 acre feet per year ("AFY").

Section 1.1.4 Discretionary Actions Required for Project 4

Implementation of Project 4 will require the following discretionary approval action by the County:

- **Conditional Use Permit ("CUP")**: To authorize the construction and operation of a solar photovoltaic electricity generating plant on 256 acres and installation of a water tank in the A-2-2 Zone. The project meets the definition of "electric generating plant" in the Los Angeles County Zoning Code. Pursuant to Section 22.24.150, electric generating plants are a use subject to a conditional use permit in the A-2 Zone.

Section 1.1.5 Statement of Project Objectives

Together, proposed Projects 1 – 6 would meet the existing and future demand for electricity generated from clean, renewable technology by generating 172 MW of electrical energy from the sun. Recent legislation enacted in California recognizes the multiple benefits associated with the development of renewable energy resources. These benefits include a reduced reliance on fossil fuel, diversification of energy portfolios, reductions in greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions, and the creation of "green" jobs within the state of California. Additionally, the Projects would assist California in meeting the newly established Renewable Energy Portfolio Standards ("RPS"). Senate Bill 14 established RPS targets for California, stating: "All retail sellers of electricity shall serve 33 percent of their load with renewable energy by 2020." State government agencies have been directed to take all appropriate actions to implement this target in all regulatory proceedings, including siting, permitting, and procurement for renewable energy power plants and transmission lines.

Each of the six proposed PV Project sites, including Project 4, qualify as eligible renewable energy resources as defined by the California Public Resources Code, and would help the State meet the objective of increasing renewable energy generation. In addition, Projects 1-6 would contribute much-needed competitive energy during peak power periods to the electrical grid in California.

As another key objective, Projects 1-6 have each been sited to minimize impacts to the environment and the local community as follows:

- Using disturbed land or land that has been previously degraded from prior use;
- Using existing electrical distribution facilities, rights-of-way, roads, and other existing infrastructure where feasible to minimize the need for new electrical support facilities; and

- Minimizing impacts to threatened or endangered species or their habitats, wetlands and waters of the United States, cultural resources, and sensitive land uses.

SECTION 1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT PROCESS

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, the County completed an Initial Study (June 13, 2012) for the proposed Project, and determined that an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") was required. A Notice of Preparation ("NOP"), including the Initial Study was circulated to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, responsible, trustee, and interested agencies, and key interest groups beginning June 20, 2012 to solicit comments on the proposed content of the Draft EIR. The NOP was circulated for the required 30-day comment period which ended July 20, 2012. A Scoping Meeting was held on July 14, 2012 at the Lancaster Library located at 601 West Lancaster Boulevard in Lancaster, California, to facilitate public review and comment on the Project.

The Draft EIR includes the Initial Study, the comment letters received during the public review period in response to the NOP, and a transcript of verbal comments received during the Scoping Meeting (see Draft EIR Appendix A-1 to A-5). All NOP comments relating to the EIR were reviewed and the issues raised in those comments were addressed, to the extent feasible, in the Draft EIR.

Potentially significant environmental impacts addressed in the Draft EIR include Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Public Services, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. The Draft EIR analyzed both Project-level and cumulative effects of the Project on these topics and identified a variety of mitigation measures to minimize, reduce, avoid, or compensate for the potential adverse effects of the proposed Project.

The Draft EIR also analyzed five potential alternatives to the proposed Project, including: 1) No Project Alternative; 2) Lower Intensity Projects; 3) Select Other Project Sites; 4) Rooftop Solar Generation; and 5) Wind Energy Generation. Potential environmental impacts of each of these alternatives were discussed at the CEQA-prescribed level of detail and comparisons were made to the proposed Project.

The Initial Study determined that the Project would result in less than significant or no impact to several environmental resource areas:

1) **Mineral Resources**: The Project would not have the potential to result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region, including those identified in a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

2) **Employment, Population & Housing**: The Project would provide significant short-term employment for construction workers during the two year construction period. The

duration of construction for the Projects would be less than two years; and construction personnel would commute to the Projects from Lancaster, the Los Angeles areas, and Kern County. However, jobs would be temporary and would be for the two year construction period. Construction workers would not establish new households and are not anticipated to permanently relocate to the area. Additionally, adequate construction personnel presently living in Los Angeles and Kern County would fill all of the jobs that will be available. Area population, housing demands and the need for educational facilities and libraries would not be affected significantly because jobs that would be created are short term in nature; therefore, they would not be impacted by the Projects. Employment, Population, and Housing would not be impacted because the Projects do not require a significant number of personnel to operate them once they are built and producing electricity, and they do not have growth inducing impacts to the local community. Requirements for operations and maintenance are not significant and would be conducted by a few specialized contracted third-party personnel who will cover the Projects. There is no operations and maintenance building on any of the Projects 1-6.

3) **Recreation**: The Project would have no impact on recreation opportunities in the area. There are adequate recreation opportunities in the area, and the availability of these would not change as a result of the Project.

Following the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("LACDRP") internal departmental review and analysis of the proposed Project through the screencheck process, the Draft EIR was submitted to the State Clearinghouse, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, and circulated for public review period beginning January 6, 2014. The 45-day public review period required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15087 ended on February 19, 2014.
A public hearing was held before the County's Hearing Examiner to take public testimony on the Draft EIR, at Lancaster Library located at 601 West Lancaster Boulevard in Lancaster, California, held at 1:00 p.m. on February 1, 2014. Approximately 80 people attended the Hearing Examiner meeting, and 26 attendees provided oral comments on the Draft EIR. A transcript of the oral comments made at the Hearing Examiner Meeting is contained in Section 2.0 of the Final EIR.

SECTION 1.3 PROJECT FINDINGS INTRODUCTION

The Findings made by the County, pursuant to Section 21081 of CEQA, and Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, on the consideration of Project 4 of the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project in unincorporated Los Angeles County, California are presented below. All potentially significant impacts of the Project identified in the Final EIR are included herein, and are organized according to the resources affected.

The Findings in this document are for Project 4 of the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project, and are supported by information and analysis from the Final EIR and other evidence in the administrative record.

For each significant impact, a Finding has been made as to one or more of the following, in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091:

A. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects on the environment.

B. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.

A narrative of supporting facts follows the appropriate Finding. For all of the impacts, one or more of the findings above have been made. The proposed Project will not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts.

SECTION 2.0 FINDINGS REGARDING POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH ARE NOT SIGNIFICANT OR WHICH HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

All Final EIR mitigation measures, as set forth in the MMRP (attached as Exhibit A to these findings) have been incorporated by reference into the conditions of approval for Project 4. These mitigation measures and conditions of approval will result in a substantial mitigation of the effects of Project 4, such that the effects are not significant or have been mitigated to a level of less than significant. Specifically, the Commission has determined, based on the Final EIR, that Project 4 design features, mitigation measures, and conditions of approval will reduce Project impacts concerning Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Public Services, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems to a level of less than significant.

2.1 AESTHETICS

Potential Effect:

Project 4 would have significant visual impacts to the Project area if it had a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; would be visible from, or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail; substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features; or create a new source of substantial light or glare which will adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 4 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Aesthetics.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The Project 4 site is not located along or in proximity to a state scenic highway. The proposed SGFs would not substantially damage or impact scenic resources such as trees (including Joshua trees) or rock outcroppings, and there are no historic buildings located on the Project 4 site. **(DEIR at 4.1-105)**. The Project 4 site is located in the west/central portion of the Antelope Valley. Vegetation that exists on the Project 4 site consists of mostly non-native species. **(DEIR at 4.1-39)**. The existing Project 4 site is vacant land in a rural area, and is typical of the surrounding landscape. The visual quality of the Project 4 site is low. The Project site itself does not have unique or rare features, or hold special significance. The topography is uniform and flat. Vegetation is uniform and consists of grasses and short shrubs. No permanent water features occur on the site, and there are no features or characteristics that set the Project 4 site apart from the surrounding desert landscape. **(DEIR at 4.1-108)**.

Rural development and public infrastructure in the landscape around the site includes farms, rural residences, agricultural fields, high-voltage power lines, PV solar fields, electrical distribution lines, roadways, and the Antelope Substation. Development near the Project 4 site is mostly rural in nature. A ranch home compound is located at the corner of West Avenue J and 87th Street West. There are several other rural ranch residences located directly adjacent to, or within 1 mile of the site. Several of the ranch residences have trees planted around them that would provide some degree of vegetative screening from the proposed SGF. A 35-acre subdivision is located approximately 0.25 miles north and 0.5 mile east of the Project 4 site, and is surrounded by a brick wall approximately 6 feet in height. Man-made features on the Project site include two-track and dirt roads. The Project 4 site is located within approximately 0.5 miles of the Antelope Substation, an approximately 90-acre substation located at West Avenue J and 95th Street West. The Antelope Substation is a major substation, and several high-voltage transmission lines and electric distribution lines connected to the Antelope Substation are located in the area. **(DEIR at 4.1-39, 40)**.

There are no designated scenic highways in the vicinity of the Project 4 site. The City of Lancaster's MEA (City of Lancaster 2009a) identifies 90th Street West and West Avenue K (between 90th Street West and 110th Street West) as potential scenic routes. 90th Street West is located adjacent to the Project 4 site, and West Avenue K is located approximately 1 mile south of the Project 4 site. However, these roadways have no official designation as scenic routes at this time. **(DEIR at 4.1-40)**. Project 4 would be visible from trails and vistas associated with the Foothills Area, and may be visible from Class III bikeways located along West Avenue I, 90th Street West, and West Avenue J. Other scenic resources identified by the City of Lancaster are located a sufficient distance away such that the Project would fade into the horizon line and not be discernible. The Project 4 gen-tie lines would be undergrounded from the Project site, under the adjacent roads, to a riser next to an existing pole. **(DEIR at 4.1-96)**. The Project 4 SGF would likely be visible from eastbound West Avenue K between 90th Street and 110th Street.

West Avenue K is valued for its views to the south of the San Gabriel Mountains and Portal Ridge foothills, but because the SGF will be located at least 1 mile north of West Avenue K, it would not impede views to the south of Portal Ridge. Also, the Antelope Substation, high-voltage transmission lines, and existing PV solar fields are situated in between West Avenue K and the proposed Project 4 SGF. Impacts to views along West Avenue K are therefore not significant. The Project 4 SGF would not be dominant in bicyclists' views unless directly adjacent to the site. When a bicyclist is adjacent to the completed SGF, their views may be partially obscured for a short time while the rider passes the Project site. The Project 4 SGF and gen-tie line would not degrade the scenic character around the bikeways, because it is not out-of-character when considering the context of the surrounding landscape. A 10-foot vegetative buffer is proposed to mitigate views along the Project 4 site boundaries facing West Avenue I, a portion of 95th Street West, 90th Street West, and West Avenue J. Therefore, these visual impacts will be less than significant (see Mitigation Measure A-4). **(DEIR at 4.1-97; 4.1-103)**.

Construction activities and equipment would be noticeable from vistas on top of and around Foothills Area due to the close proximity of the SGF, from 90th Avenue West, and from the Class III bikeways. During construction of the SGF, disturbance areas would appear as large patches of fine, buff-colored rock and soil. **(DEIR at 4.1-96)**. Because construction activities would be limited to daylight hours, impacts from nighttime lighting would not occur. Lighting will comply with the Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance, and impacts would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure A-5. Any visible dust produced during construction would be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of the fugitive dust plan (Mitigation Measure A-1). Any trash, debris, and waste would be removed from the Project 4 site during construction and the site would be screened or partially screened by fencing, as required by Mitigation Measures A-2 and A-3. **(DEIR at 4.1-96; 4.1-112)**.

Because of the low height of the solar modules, no significant shadows would be cast upon nearby sensitive land uses. The SGF would not create a significant source of light. Light sources associated with the SGF would be minimal, and would be restricted to that required for nighttime safety and security according to County requirements and would comply with all requirements of the Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Only permitted types of lights would be used and specified height limits employed. Lighting would be installed and directed downward and shielded to avoid light trespass. The amount of light generated by the security lights would be consistent with the provisions of the new Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance, and would allow less light trespass than existing sources of light produced by man-made structures adjacent to the proposed site, including residences, roadway lights, and other existing nearby facilities. Motion sensors and time limits would be employed per the lighting ordinance. Project 4 equipment and components would introduce minimal amounts of glare to the existing landscape. The PV modules are designed to absorb sunlight, and the glass modules that protect the PV surface are typically formulated to allow sunlight to pass with minimal reflection. Impacts from new sources of light or glare will be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure A-5. **(DEIR at 4.1-113)**.

No trails are located on the Project 4 site, therefore the Project 4 SGF would not cause the vacation of any portion of any trail, nor would it obstruct expansive views from any trails.

(DEIR at 4.1-102). After construction, the Project 4 SGF would be visible from the Foothills Area. A post-construction photographic simulation was completed from a viewpoint in the Foothills Area (see DEIR Figure 4.1-35). The photograph was taken from a picnic area along the California Aqueduct Trail, east of Johnson Road and approximately 2.8 miles southwest of the Project 4 site. A contrast rating was conducted from this viewpoint to assess the level of contrast that would be introduced by the proposed SGF from the scenic area, which was determined to be low from this viewpoint. No noticeable modifications to landforms are anticipated. The removal of vegetation (the shrubs on the south side of the road) would introduce a weak level of contrast compared with existing conditions. The solar modules would create a low contrast in form, line, color, and texture from existing conditions. The SGF would appear similar to the existing PV solar fields located adjacent to the proposed SGF. Compared to agricultural areas, the SGF would appear slightly darker in color, but the form of the solar field and the lines created by the edges of the solar field mimic the appearance of an agricultural field from this distance and vantage point. The Project 4 SGF, including the gen-tie line, would not dominate views from the Foothills Area given the degree of modifications that have already been introduced to the landscape, including roads, electrical infrastructure (PV solar fields, transmission lines, substations, and distribution lines), and agricultural fields. **(DEIR at 4.1-97; 4.1-103)**.

After construction, it is highly unlikely that the Project 4 SGF would be discernible from Little Buttes, Quartz Hill, or the California Poppy Reserve, all of which are located over six miles from the site. **(DEIR at 4.1-40)**. Even from a superior viewing position at Quartz Hill or the California Poppy Reserve, a viewer is not likely to be able to distinguish the Project site from eight miles away from the Project site. If the SGF was visible from that distance, it would not appear dissimilar to adjacent existing PV solar fields, an agricultural field or the Antelope Substation in size, shape, and color. **(DEIR at 4.1-97)**. Project 4 would not significantly impact views from residences in the Westview Estates Subdivision because of screening provided by adjacent homes and the privacy wall surrounding the subdivision. **(DEIR at 4.1-109)**.

Project 4's visual impacts are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

A-1 A Fugitive Dust Control Plan to minimize dust (visual pollution) shall be prepared and implemented.

A-2 The Project site shall be maintained free of debris, trash, and waste during construction.

A-3 The Project site shall be visually screened or partially screened during construction by fencing.

A-4 A landscape plan shall be developed for each Project prior to Project construction that shows the detail of a 10-foot wide screening vegetation buffer intended to screen or partially screen the Project visually from area residents or travelers on nearby roadways.

A-5 All lighting shall comply with applicable provisions of the Los Angeles County Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Lights shall be limited to types allowed by the ordinance, installed below maximum allowed heights, pointed downwards and shielded to minimize

light trespass, and mounted on essential infrastructure rather than on separate light poles except where poles are required by regulation or by governing agency. Lighting will comply with the hours of operation requirements in the ordinance, and utilize automatic control devices to comply with time limits except where permitted by Los Angeles County. Lighting will be maintained in good repair at all times.

2.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 4 would have a significant impact on Agriculture and Forestry Resources if it would: convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use; conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract; conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)); result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or 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.

Finding:

Project 4 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Agriculture and Forestry Resources. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

As currently mapped under 2010 data from the Department of Conservation ("DOC") Farmland Monitoring and Mapping Program ("FMMP"), the Project 4 site contains 113.7 acres of Prime Farmland and 43.4 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance. The DOC states that Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance "must have been used for irrigated agricultural production at some time during the four years prior to the mapping date." Of the 113.7 acres that were classified as Prime Farmland, 61.1 acres were last irrigated in 1972, and 52.6 acres were last irrigated in 1961. Current landowners have confirmed no agricultural production in the past four years. Of the 43.4 acres that are considered Farmland of Statewide Importance according to the DOC FMMP 2010 data, 5.7 acres were briefly irrigated in 2003, previously non-irrigated since 1961, and the remaining 38.7 acres were last irrigated in 1972. The Project 4 gen-tie line would traverse in public ROW underground and through land designated as Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance. None of the designated acreage has been utilized for agricultural production or irrigated for well over the four-year limit. Therefore, the Applicant is seeking to remove the farmland designations from the Project 4 site. The DOC has reviewed the site and, in a letter dated December 31, 2012, determined that the properties "will be reclassified to Grazing Land on the 2012 edition of the Important Farmland Map for Los Angeles County." (See DEIR Appendix B.11). Once the designations have been updated, the property will not

contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-6)**.

Project 4 contains no forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. **(DEIR at 4.2-8)**.

Project 4 is located within the Los Angeles County Zoning Ordinance designation A-2, Heavy Agriculture. According to LACDRP, a solar electricity energy generating facility is allowed in Zone A-2 with the issuance of a CUP (Chapter 22.24.150[A]). Furthermore, Project 4 will not preclude future agricultural uses. Project 4 and its associated gen-tie lines are located within a LACDRP Agricultural Opportunity Area ("AOA"). The Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan Policy states that these areas should be protected from incompatible uses. The Antelope Valley Area Plan states that applications for non-agricultural uses in the AOA areas will be evaluated for their impact upon adjacent agricultural operations.

Project 4 would involve conversion of land that was formerly used for agricultural production to renewable electricity energy production. Construction and operation of Project 4 would not involve other restrictions, obstructions, or resources that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. The Project 4 site has not been irrigated since 1972. The Project would produce power in a passive manner and would result in minimal air pollutant emissions, traffic, and noise, and would not affect adjacent agricultural operations.

Project 4 and its associated gen-tie lines are located in an AOA, but are not currently utilized for agricultural purposes. Additionally, the proposed properties are not designated under a Williamson Act contract. As a result, construction and operation of Project 4 would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, impacts to existing agricultural use zoning, designated AOAs, and Williamson Act contracts will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-7)**.

Project 4 and its associated gen-tie lines will temporarily preclude future agricultural use at the Project 4 site. Following the termination of power generating activities at the Project 4 site, all facilities and equipment would be removed and the land would be restored as near to its pre-development condition as possible in the event a new similar land use is not contemplated at that time by then current owners. A decommissioning and reclamation plan detailing land restoration activities will be provided, as required by Los Angeles County as part of the CUP. Additionally, the Applicant will be required to provide a decommissioning bond, or other suitable financial guarantee acceptable to the County, equal to the amount of money estimated to be required to decommission the Project, including any additional environmental review which might become necessary, and restore the land to as near its pre-development condition as possible. Project 4 will not impact any land use outside the development site's limits. Impacts regarding the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-9)**.

2.3 AIR QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Project 4 would have a significant impact on Air Quality if it would: conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; cumulatively produce a considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors); expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 4 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Air Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Pursuant to the Clean Air Act ("CAA"), the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District ("AVAQMD") is required to reduce project emissions of criteria pollutants for which the Mojave Desert Air Basin ("MDAB") is in non-attainment. Project 4 is located within a non-attainment area, which means that certain Project-related activities could potentially be subject to emission control strategies contained within the AVAQMD Federal 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan. Construction would involve activities that can result in emissions of particulate matter ("PM"). However, construction of PV panels and the generation-tie line would not require intense earthmoving activities, only the low-impact method of mowing the surface. Compliance with applicable rules, ordinances, plans, and policies would minimize PM emissions during construction. Project 4 construction emissions would not exceed emission thresholds, and would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-28)**. Since construction of Projects 1-6 would occur consecutively over the course of two years, construction of the six Projects could overlap, which may cause a peak in the Projects' daily construction emissions. However, maximum daily and annual construction emissions would not exceed the appropriate AVAQMD significant thresholds for all pollutants, even with the potential overlap in construction schedules. **(DEIR at 4.3-37)**.

During operation of Project 4, the Project site would undergo maintenance and security activities no more than 10 times annually (as needed), and would not create a daily increase in population or visitors. The assumption of 10 annual trips includes truck trips associated with panel washing. Project 4 would comply with AVAQMD rules and Los Angeles County ordinances, and is designed to be consistent with applicable county policies and the Attainment Plan. Therefore, Project 4 would not conflict with implementing the applicable air quality plan. **(DEIR at 4.3-25; 4.3-40)**.

Project 4 emissions estimates are based on compliance with AVAQMD Rule 403 requirements for fugitive dust suppression, watering exposed surfaces two times daily. The short-term emissions during Project 4 construction would not exceed AVAQMD significance thresholds. As such, Project 4 would not exceed thresholds, result in violating air quality standards, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. **(DEIR at 4.3-28)**. Likewise, even when all six Projects operate concurrently, the operation of all six Projects would not exceed annual thresholds, violate air quality standards, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. **(DEIR at 4.3-42)**.

Decommissioning of Project 4 (and each of the six Project sites) would require removal of the PV modules, PV module mounting system, electrical boxes, electrical inverters and transformers, electrical AC collection system, switchgear, data monitoring equipment, chain link perimeter security fencing, concrete ballasts, underground vaults, other concrete pads, and transporting all components off site. Air quality emissions from decommissioning would be generated from the pieces of equipment used and any fugitive dust from site preparation activities. Equipment used for decommissioning and removal of concrete ballasts, underground vaults, concrete pads, etc. generally would be similar to that used for construction, except that no mowing or clearing would be required.

Since decommissioning does not involve mowing or clearing activities, the level of fugitive dust emissions would be less than emissions created during construction. After removal of equipment and facilities, the site would need to be re-vegetated. Decommissioning would occur after at least 25 years of operation; therefore, equipment engine technology is likely to be more advanced, and fuels to be cleaner. Criteria pollutant emissions during decommissioning would be equal to or, more likely, less than those estimated from construction for Project 4, and will also be less than significant with mitigation. **(DEIR at 4.3-42)**. Similar to criteria pollutant emissions, hazardous air pollutant emissions during decommissioning would be less than during construction due to advanced equipment engine technology and cleaner fuel and would therefore be less than significant. Exhaust from off-road equipment and on-road vehicles used during decommissioning and construction truck trips would not be expected to create objectionable odors, and would therefore be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-42).**

The MDAB is currently nonattainment for federal and state ozone standards and nonattainment for state PM_{10} standards, which may cause emissions from Project 4 to contribute to an existing or projected air quality standard exceedance. Implementing any of the six Projects (including Project 4) would increase short-term emissions related to construction, and a negligible increase in long-term emissions related to SGF operation and maintenance. Construction for all six sites is expected to be staggered, and may extend over two years. Nevertheless, due to the nature and size of each site, simultaneous construction would not result in emissions of ozone precursors or PM_{10} that exceed daily thresholds. As shown in DEIR Table 4.3-12, “Mitigated Peak Daily Concurrent Construction Emissions”, and DEIR Table 4.3-13, “Peak Annual Concurrent Construction Emissions”, the impacts would be less than significant prior to mitigation. Implementing control strategies to reduce PM_{10} further minimizes air emissions. As such, construction of Project 4 would not 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). **(DEIR at 4.3-43)**.

During the operation phase, Project 4 will have no major emissions sources. Facility operating equipment that emits regulated air pollutants or requires AVAQMD permits is not planned at Project 4 or any of the six Project sites. As shown in DEIR Table 4.3-20, "Peak Annual Concurrent Operation Emissions", the impacts would be less than significant. As such, operation of Project 4 would not 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). **(DEIR at 4.3-43)**.

Project 4 was analyzed for air impacts to nearby sensitive receptors; however, sensitive receptors would only be exposed during construction activities. PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations are expected to occur primarily from fugitive dust emissions during mowing, excavation activities and, to a lesser degree, during PV installation and paving. Rule 401 requires that airborne particles remain on the site from which they originate under normal wind conditions. Proper mitigation techniques must be implemented to ensure that fugitive dust is contained. Emissions are not expected to expose even the closest sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and, due to the distance between Project sites, simultaneous construction at two sites would not significantly impact the same sensitive receptors. **(DEIR at 4.3-44)**.

Operational emissions from Project 4 would not impact local air pollutant levels at nearby receptors. As mentioned above, sensitive receptors would only be exposed, if at all, during construction activities. The primary source of Project emissions during operation is the vehicles used by facility maintenance staff traveling to and from the site. Maintenance is expected to occur no more than 10 times per year. Overall, Project 4 would not result in an increase in VMT over the course of one summer or winter day. Thus, Project 4 would not result in new long-term stationary sources, nor would they result in a significant number of net new vehicular trips. Carbon monoxide (CO) impacts from operation of Project 4 to sensitive receptors would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-44)**.

Short-term concentration levels during the construction phase will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, including those resulting in a cancer risk greater than the EPA screening levels. **(DEIR at 4.3-45)**. Due to continuous construction of each of the six Project sites over the course of two years (which may overlap), long-term cancer impacts from construction activities to the nearest sensitive receptors were evaluated, and found that even with the cumulative contribution of health risk impacts from all six proposed Projects, the cumulative cancer risk to the identified sensitive receptors is still below the cancer risk exposure level. **(DEIR at 4.3-46)**. Short-term concentration levels during Project 4 site construction will neither expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, nor exceed the cancer risk screening levels. **(DEIR at 4.3-47)**.

Project 4's Air Quality impacts are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

AQ-1 Water active sites at least twice daily (locations where soil disturbance is to occur would be thoroughly watered before earthmoving) during construction, or, in locations where water alone does not suffice to suppress dust adequately apply nontoxic chemical soil

stabilizers, according to manufacturers' specifications. Temporarily stockpiled soil shall be secured with tarps or plastic sheeting or sprayed with non-toxic soil stabilizers.

AQ-2 All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).

AQ-3 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.

AQ-4 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not idle more than five minutes in any one hour.

AQ-5 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operation of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.

AQ-6 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.

AQ-7 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.

AQ-8 During array area preparation, mowing shall be used instead of grading and/or disking, and shall be limited to no more than 3.5 acres per day per site to further reduce dust emissions during construction.

AQ-9 All interior roads shall use long-lasting non-toxic chemical soil stabilizers designed for long-term dust stabilization on dirt roads.

AQ-10 Interior array areas shall have re-established pre-existing vegetation or be established with drought tolerant, native, or native compatible vegetation approved by the County biologist and compliant with Fire Department requirements, within two years of energization authorization of an array area by the Department of Public Works, Building and Safety Division, to provide long-term dust stabilization under the arrays.

AQ-11 Earth disturbing activities shall be suspended and/or additional water shall be applied to meet Rule 403 criteria if wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour.

AQ-12 Construction activity shall utilize electricity from power poles on or adjacent to the Project sites rather than use of temporary diesel power generators and/or gasoline power generators when electricity with adequate circuit capacity is available from power poles in proximity to construction areas.

AQ-13 In the event temporary night lighting is necessary for construction or maintenance purposes, lighting not requiring the use of diesel or gasoline driven generators shall be used.

2.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 4 would have a significant impact on biological resources if it would: 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 Wildlife ("CDFW") or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ("USFWS"); have a substantial adverse effect on sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations of CDFW or USFWS; have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including marshes, vernal pools, and coastal wetlands) or waters of the United States, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; 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; convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, southern California black walnut, etc.); conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas ("SEAs") (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Section 22.56.215), and the Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas ("SERAs"), (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Section 22.44, Part 6); or conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 4 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Biological Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 4 does not contain riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, wetlands, Joshua trees, or yucca trees on the site, and does not contain non-jurisdictional or state regulated waters. **(DEIR at 4.4-59)**. There are no wetlands, vernal pools, or riparian habitat identified on Project 4. Based on the observation during the biological surveys conducted for the EIR, APNs 3218-002-018 and 3218-002-023 have natural swales located onsite, but these do not support wetlands or

riparian vegetation or riparian habitats. A man-made agricultural irrigation canal is present along Lancaster Blvd. on the northern boundary of APNs 3203-002-012 and 3203-002-014. This feature does not support riparian vegetation or riparian habitats. Project 4 does not have any features that could be federally protected wetlands (including marshes, vernal pools, and coastal wetlands) or waters of the United States, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. **(DEIR at 4.4-60, 61)**.

Project 4 does not contain oak trees, juniper trees, Joshua trees, or other unique native trees. **(DEIR at 4.4-62)**. Project 4 and the immediate vicinity do not contain or conflict with any Significant Ecological Areas ("SEAs"), Wildflower Reserve Areas, or Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas ("SERAs"). The closest SEAs to Project 4 are the Ritter Ridge SEA located approximately 6 miles southeast of Project 4, Portal Ridge-Liebre Mountain located approximately 5 miles west of Project 4, and the Fairmont and Antelope Buttes SEA located approximately 5 miles northwest of Project 4. The Angeles National Forest is located approximately 6 miles to the southwest of Project 4 and the Antelope Valley California Poppy Preserve is located approximately 6 miles northwest of Project 4. Therefore, Project 4 would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. **(DEIR at 4.4-63, 64)**. There are no adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plans in effect within the boundaries of the Project 4 site. **(DEIR at 4.4-64)**.

Project 4 has low potential for northern California legless lizard and burrowing owl to occur on the parcels which comprise the Project 4 site. There is low to moderate potential for Coast horned lizard to occur. The parcels which comprise Project 4 were determined to be potential habitat for Ferruginous hawk, and foraging habitat for Merlin. Low-quality nesting and foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk is also present on some of the parcels which comprise Project 4. Developing the site as a solar generating facility would remove habitat for these species, and the 135.6 acres of land for Project 4 would be mostly unavailable as wildlife habitat during the life of Project 4, which would result in a significant impact. However, mitigation measures will reduce this impact to less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.4-58)**.

Project 4 is located within an area of topographically homogeneous open space, and there are no local constraints to movement of resident or migratory wildlife that development of Project 4 would further aggravate. There are no known wildlife migration pathways that would be impacted by Project 4. **(DEIR 4.4-61)**.

Wildlife nursery areas on the Project 4 site may include nesting sites of native bird species, which are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-712; Ch. 128; July 13, 1918; 40 Stat. 755) and the California Fish and Game Code Section 3503. Burrowing owls may have suitable burrows on the Project 4 site, and protections for bird nesting and burrowing owls are provided in Mitigation Measures B-1, B-2, B-3 and B-4. The intent of acquiring mitigation lands would be to select available parcels that would replace lost breeding/foraging/winter foraging habitat and enhance the overall quality of habitat for a variety of species including migratory bird species. The potential to acquire parcels that would also maintain or enhance wildlife migration corridors in the area would also be considered. Planting of shrubs and native vegetation on the Project 4 site would improve the opportunities for shrub-nesting bird species on the Project 4 site when it is complete. **(DEIR 4.4-61)**.

Project 4 impacts to Biological Resources are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

B-1: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a qualified biologist shall be retained by the Applicant as the lead biological monitor subject to the approval of the LACDRP and CDFW. That person shall ensure that impacts to all biological resources are minimized or avoided, and shall conduct (or supervise) pre-grading field surveys for species that may be avoided, affected, or eliminated as a result of grading or any other site preparation activities. The lead biological monitor shall ensure that all surveys are conducted by qualified personnel (e.g. avian biologists for bird surveys, herpetologists for reptile surveys, etc.) and that they possess all necessary permits and memoranda of understanding with the appropriate agencies for the handling of potentially-occurring special-status species. The lead biological monitor shall also ensure that daily monitoring reports (e.g., survey results, protective actions, results of protective actions, adaptive measures, etc.) are prepared, and shall make these monitoring reports available to LACDRP and CDFW at their request.

B-2: Pre-Construction surveys will be conducted prior to ground disturbance at each project site. These surveys will include all special-status species identified as having the potential to be present on the project site; including, but not limited to, badger, kit fox, southern grasshopper mouse, and the species listed below.

Pre-survey information gathering will include review of all available agency nest data and mapping.

- A focused pre-construction Swainson's hawk survey shall be conducted to locate any nesting sites within 5 miles of Projects 1 – 6. If Swainson's hawks or their active nests are located within 500 feet of the project sites, all construction-related work shall be postponed and CDFW will be consulted.

- Project-related activities likely to have the potential of disturbing suitable bird nesting habitat, which includes ground nesting birds, shall be prohibited from February 1 through August 31, unless a qualified monitoring biologist conducts nesting bird surveys prior to any construction-related disturbance to confirm the absence of active bird nests or bird nesting habitat. Disturbance shall be defined as any activity that physically removes or damages vegetation or habitat or any action that may cause disruption of nesting behavior such as loud noise from equipment or artificial night lighting. Surveys shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. If an active bird nest is discovered, disturbance within 500 feet for raptors shall be postponed until the nest is vacated, offspring are independent of the nest area and there is no evidence of further attempts at nesting. Limits of avoidance shall be marked with high-visibility flagging or fencing. The Applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures and submit the records to LACDRP and CDFW to document compliance with applicable state and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds.

- A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted on each site prior to grading. Pre-construction surveys for burrowing owl shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. The surveys shall follow the protocols set forth by the California Burrowing Owl Consortium (1993 and 2012).

  If burrowing owls are found during the pre-construction survey, then replacement burrows and habitat must be provided prior to the commencement of construction. The Applicant shall be prepared to provide artificial replacement burrows in the event that owls are detected, either as wintering or breeding individuals.

  Wintering individuals may be evicted with the use of exclusion devices followed by a period of seven days to ensure that animals have left their burrows. When it can be assured that owls are no longer using the burrows, the burrows can be hand-excavated and collapsed under the supervision of the avian biologist.

  Breeding owls must not be disturbed and must be allowed to complete the raising of young until the fledglings can forage independently of adults and it can be confirmed that further attempts at nesting shall not be undertaken. When this has been confirmed, the owls can be evicted as described above for wintering animals.

- Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for special-status ground-dwelling reptiles, including but not limited to coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard. Surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground 4 to 6 weeks in advance of the survey effort, checking weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles or other species determined important by the qualified biological monitor (i.e., biologist must be appropriately permitted for collection and relocation activities) occurring within the work area prior to the start of work shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.

B-3: During grading, earthmoving activities, and other construction activities the biological monitor shall be present to inspect and enforce all mitigation requirements and to relocate any species that may come into harm's way to an appropriate offsite location of similar habitat. The biological monitor shall be authorized to stop specific grading or construction activities if violations of mitigation measures or any local, state, or federal laws are suspected. The biological monitor shall file a report of the monitoring activities with LACDRP and CDFW during construction activities, as frequently as required by LACDRP and CDFW. If ongoing biological monitoring of construction activities reveals the presence of any special-status reptiles within an active work area, then work shall be temporarily halted until the animals can be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones. Work areas shall be surveyed for special-status reptile species, such as the coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard, during construction activities. During the construction, surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground in appropriate work areas and checking them weekly for such species. Any

special-status reptiles occurring within the work area shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.

B-4: Mitigation lands shall be acquired for Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, special-status migratory and wintering birds, and alkali mariposa lily.

Swainson's hawk: Impacts due to development of the projects shall be mitigated by the acquisition of good quality Swainson's hawk habitat targeted within the Antelope Valley. Land shall be purchased or placed in a conservation easement or other suitable deed restriction and managed to maintain suitable habitat in perpetuity.

The proposed development is not expected to result in the "take" of Swainson's hawk; however, the Applicant shall be required to consult CDFW in the event of take, which may result in additional mitigation prescribed by CDFW. Although the Projects are not expected to result in "take" of Swainson's hawk, mitigation will still be required to alleviate the effects of cumulative impacts on raptor, migratory bird, and burrowing owl habitats:

Replacement land will be provided based on the quality of the mitigation land relative to the impacted habitat. The ratio of such replacement shall be determined as follows:

- A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 3 acres of development if the replacement land is superior nesting and foraging habitat contiguous to occupied nesting and foraging habitat, and is within a designated or proposed SEA.

- A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 2 acres of development if the replacement land is unoccupied irrigated land, contiguous to occupied habitat and providing superior quality foraging habitat with trees or other such nesting habitat;

- A ratio of 1 acre of replacement land for each acre of development if the replacement land provides similar foraging and nesting habitat.

Burrowing Owl: Mitigation for any occupied burrowing owl burrows found during preconstruction surveys will include a comprehensive tiered approach:

- Pre-construction and construction monitoring surveys conducted by a qualified biologist to detect potential new owl activity onsite;

- Disturbance avoidance of occupied burrows during nesting period February 1 – August 31;

- Impact avoidance of occupied burrows;

- Burrow exclusion and closure and offsite relocation (>100 m), as described previously in in B-2, will be conducted for unavoidable impacts to occupied burrows (after consultation with CDFW).

- Minimizing impacts by protecting in-place any owls, their burrows, and their immediate habitat by establishing setback zones and visual screens for burrows adjacent to construction activity; by placing visible markers, and by conducting construction worker awareness training. Setback widths will be applied as appropriate to the level of existing disturbance and owl stage of activity (e.g., for low to moderate construction-related disturbance activity outside the nesting season near burrows in currently high-traffic or disturbance areas, it is assumed owls are adapted to human disturbance and will not need a large setback).

- Mitigating unavoidable impacts to habitat: restore temporary impacts to pre-existing conditions; replace nesting/occupied and satellite burrows lost with the same number of suitable burrows on the mitigation site. Mitigation acreage for foraging habitat provided for Swainson's hawk will be sufficient to replace lost burrowing owl habitat because the hawk's replacement habitat will be in-kind or better (i.e., the Project habitat is low quality overall and mitigation habitat will be at least the same quality as the lost habitat OR will have higher quality habitat features overall, such as increased vegetative structure, higher numbers of prey species, less disturbance, and less potential for predation by domestic animals, etc.). Specific habitat considerations as provided in the CDFW 2012 burrowing owl guidance will be considered in selecting the overall habitat replacement acres for the project.

Alkali Mariposa Lily: Alkali mariposa lily will be avoided to the greatest extent possible. If preconstruction surveys reveal individuals that cannot be avoided, mitigation of lost alkali mariposa lily shall be provided at a minimum 1:1 ratio. This acreage will be calculated with input from LACDRP and CDFW. Additionally, because alkali mariposa Lilies have locally available seed sources, plantings of the lilies on appropriate soil types on Projects shall be implemented in selected areas. The lilies may also be transplanted from areas planned for disturbance to more suitable locations in the Project area. Transplantation locations must be situated within adequately buffered areas to be found suitable.

For all species the mitigation acreage may be located within the Project sites, but outside of the area of development, subject to LACDRP and CDFW approval, if acreage of sufficient quantity and quality exists.

B-5: Review and Approval of Habitat Management Lands Prior to Acquisition: The Applicant shall provide a mitigation land acquisition proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for their approval before acquiring the property. The proposal shall discuss the suitability of the property by comparing it to the selection criteria. As a part of the preparation of the land acquisition proposal, acreage quantification by habitat category will be developed with LACDRP and CDFW based on the following criteria:

> **Habitat Management Land Selection Criteria**: The Applicant must identify the region within which lands shall be acquired, and the type and quality of habitat to be acquired.
>
> Detailed criteria and acreage for each habitat category will be developed with Los Angeles County and CDFW. Foraging habitat shall be assessed as moderate to good with

a capacity to improve in quality and value to Swainson's hawks, and must be within the Antelope Valley Swainson's hawk breeding range. Foraging habitat with suitable nest trees is preferred.

Habitat Management Lands Acquisition: Prior to initiating ground-disturbing activities, the Applicant shall provide a proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for off-site mitigation land to be restored, enhanced, or maintained according to the requirements of the biological mitigation measures in this EIR. The proposal will require that mitigation lands identified shall be preserved as open space in perpetuity. Within 45 days of acquiring the mitigation land(s), the Applicant shall record a permanent deed restriction on the mitigation land(s) to be preserved as open space. The deed restriction or conservation easement language shall be submitted to LACDRP and CDFW for review and approval prior to recordation. Alternatively, should a conservation easement on the mitigation land be offered, the permanent conservation easement shall be recorded to the satisfaction of LACDRP and CDFW.

The Applicant shall establish a fund sufficient for the restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation land(s) until such time when the mitigation land(s) become self-sustaining and until such time as the mitigation land(s) meet the requirements of this mitigation measure. The fund shall be established within 90 days of mitigation land(s) acquisition in an amount acceptable to the LACDRP and CDFW.

Land Acquisition Schedule and Financial Assurances: The Applicant shall complete acquisition, or execute an irrevocable option to purchase, of proposed Habitat Management lands and shall provide financial assurances for dedicating adequate funding for impact avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, if necessary, prior to the issuance of building permits. If an irrevocable option to purchase is utilized, the Applicant shall provide a proposed date of purchase which coincides with construction of the facility.

B-6: Prior to alteration of any streambeds, the Applicant shall enter into an agreement with the CDFW, pursuant to Sections 1601 through 1603 of the State Fish and Game Code.

B-7: Within all interior portions of the site within and adjacent to the proposed solar arrays, re-vegetation shall be accomplished (excluding interior roads) as follows:

Vegetation seeded in these areas shall comprise locally-sourced, native species if available, or, native compatible as approved by the County biologist if sufficient locally-sourced native seed stock is not available, approximating low-growing communities such as native perennial or annual grasslands (i.e., wildflower fields). Shrub species shall not be used due to these species inability to survive continued vegetation trimming. Vegetation shall be maintained in accordance with Los Angeles County Fire Department regulations.

2.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 4 would have a significant effect on Cultural Resources or Paleontological Resources if it would: cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5; cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 4 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Cultural Resources and Paleontological Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

No historical resources were detected within Project 4 during the transect survey conducted for the EIR. Site "P-19-004223" and "P19-189453", two historic period farming complexes, were recorded at this location. Both sites lack integrity and the recordation of surface artifacts has likely exhausted the date potential for the sites. Site P19-004223 and P19-189453 are recommended as not eligible for listing on the is recommended as not eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources ("CRHR") or National Register of Historic Places ("NRHP"), and no further management consideration of these resources is necessary. Therefore, construction, operation and maintenance of Project 4 will not cause any change in the significance of historical resources. **(DEIR at 4.5-24)**.

Two previously recorded resources were revealed in the file search for Project 4. P19-189425 is an historic electric transmission line that has not been evaluated for CRHR eligibility. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3, calling for avoidance of this resource, will ensure that impacts to this resource are reduced to a less than significant level. Site number CA-LAN-1579H, the historic Del Sur Cemetery, is located within the boundary of Project 4. This cemetery has not been evaluated for CRHR eligibility, but a survey conducted by the Institute for Canine Forensics established that there are still human remains interred at that location. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-4, calling for avoidance of this resource, and Mitigation Measure CUL 5, calling for archaeological monitoring around the perimeter of the former cemetery site, will ensure that impacts to this resource are reduced to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-24)**.

There is a possibility that historical and/or archaeological materials would be uncovered during necessary subsurface excavations for the construction of the proposed Project 4. Although the likelihood of encountering archaeological resources on the site is considered low, this impact is potentially significant. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, which describes procedures to be followed in the event that cultural resources are discovered, is

required. CUL-1 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. In addition, the possibility that other previously undiscovered remains could be found within the boundary of Project 4 during construction will be addressed by implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2. **(DEIR at 4.5-25)**.

No paleontological resources were detected during the transect survey of Project 4. Based on the paleontological assessment conducted for the EIR, it is unlikely that any intact significant paleontological resources are or will be located on the Project 4 site. Therefore, Project 4 would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources. If Project excavations reach 10 feet or more below current grade and reveal that older Quaternary deposits and/or the later Miocene deposits are exposed, there will be a higher potential for encountering significant vertebrate fossil remains. Deep cuts should be inspected by a qualified paleontologist in an attempt to identify the more sensitive older alluvial strata. **(DEIR at 4.5-31)**.

There is a possibility that paleontological materials would be uncovered if excavations for the construction of the proposed Project 4 reach a depth of 10 feet or more below current grade. Although the likelihood of encountering paleontological resources within the Project 4 area is considered low, this impact is potentially significant. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure PALEO-1, the development of a Paleontological Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Plan ("PRMMP") by a qualified paleontologist is required if construction excavation depth is below 10 feet or more below current grade. PALEO-1 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-31)**. Operation of Project 4 would not require any excavations to the depth of potential paleontological resources. There, operation of Project 4 would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources. **(DEIR at 4.5-31)**.

There is a possibility that human remains, historical, and/or archaeological materials would be uncovered during necessary subsurface excavations for the construction of the proposed Project 4 near the boundary of CA-LAN-1579H. Although the likelihood of encountering archaeological resources on the site is considered low, this impact is potentially significant. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-4, avoidance of the site, CUL-5, archaeological monitoring of the defined perimeter of the site, and CUL-1, which describes procedures to be followed in the event that cultural resources are discovered, is required. Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-4, and CUL-5 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-33)**.

Project 4 impacts related to Cultural Resources are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

CUL-1: In the event cultural resources are encountered during construction of the Projects, all ground-disturbing activities within the vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall be notified of the find. The archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall make recommendations to

the Lead Agency on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to recordation and excavation of the finds and evaluation and processing of the finds in accordance with § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of, but are not limited to, stone, bone, fossils, wood or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites.

If the resources are determined to be unique historic resources as defined under § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, Mitigation Measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate Mitigation Measures for significant resources could include but not be limited to avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds.

No further earthwork shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any archaeological artifacts recovered because of mitigation will be donated to a qualified scientific institution approved by the Lead Agency where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.

CUL-2: In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, California State Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 dictates that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to CEQA regulations and PRC § 5097.98. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.

CUL-3: Project 4 construction of gen-tie lines shall maintain the right of way buffer zones prescribed by SCE for this historic electric transmission line resource, which is an active transmission line. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.

CUL-4: Project construction for Project 4 shall maintain a one acre undisturbed area surrounding the Del Sur Cemetery site. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.

CUL-5: A County approved archaeologist will be retained to initiate and supervise cultural resource monitoring during Project related earthwork in areas of the Project that are within 50 feet from certain significant cultural resources, specifically from the defined perimeter of site CA-LAN-1579H (Project 4). If resources are identified, the procedures outlined in CUL-1 will be followed and/or CUL-2 (as necessary). This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.

PALEO-1: A qualified paleontologist shall be retained by the Applicant prior to excavations reaching 10 feet in depth or greater. The paleontologist shall develop and execute a PRMMP and supervise a paleontological monitor whom shall monitor all ground-disturbing activities associated with such excavations. The Program will

outline the procedures to follow in regards to paleontological resources (e.g. monitoring protocols, curation, data recovery of fossils, reporting). If fossils are found during such excavation, the paleontological monitor shall be authorized to halt ground-disturbing activities within 25 feet of the find to allow evaluation of the find and determination of appropriate treatment according to the Program.

2.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Potential Effect:

Project 4 would have a significant effect on Geology and Soils if it would: expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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 active fault trace; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides; result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; 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; be located on expansive soil; have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater; or conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance or hillside design standards in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element.

Finding:

Project 4 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Geology and Soils. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 4 and the Project 4 gen-tie line are not located in an active or potentially active fault zone according to the California Geological Survey ("CGS") Seismic Hazard Zone Maps (CGS 2008) and Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map (CGS 2010). The closest fault zones are the San Andreas Fault Zone, which is located approximately 4.2 miles to the south southwest of the Project 4 site, and the Garlock Fault Zone, which is located approximately 20 miles northwest of the Project 4 site. Based on research and available information, Project 4 is susceptible to seismicity, but is not susceptible to fault rupture; therefore, impacts involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-14)**.

The United States Geological Survey ("USGS") National Seismic Hazard Map (2008) indicates that Project 4 and the Project 4 gen-tie line are located in an area mapped from 40 to 60 percent

gravity for peak horizontal acceleration with a 10 percent probability of exceedance in the next 50 years. According to the USGS, and dependent on structural design, 10 percent gravity is the lower threshold at which damages to structures are likely to occur. Based on geologic and soil conditions at the site, the USGS Ground Motion Parameter Calculator indicates that Project 4 facilities will need to be designed to sustain spectral accelerations of approximately 0.664 to 1.567 percent gravity (USGS 2012). **(DEIR at 4.6-17)**.

Project 4 has the potential to be subjected to ground motion during construction. However, because of the temporary nature of the construction period relative to the frequency of occurrence of significant seismic events, the potential for Project 4 construction to expose people or structures to substantially adverse effects due to seismicity and ground motion will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-17)**. During operation of the facility, all Project 4 structures and operational facilities will be designed in accordance with the California Building Code ("CBC") and applicable industry standards. The design and construction of Project 4 would comply with all applicable building codes and standards established by regulatory agencies, including the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the CBC. Therefore, Project 4 impacts related to seismic shaking and strong ground motion hazards would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-17)**.

The CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) does not identify Project 4 or the Project 4 gen-tie line as being located in zones with the potential for liquefaction or ground failure. Additionally, Project 4 is located on poorly sorted coarse grained materials with groundwater typically greater than 100 feet below ground surface (bgs) (USGS 2008). Based on available geologic information, the potential susceptibility of ground failure is less than significant for Project 4 construction and operation. **(DEIR at 4.6-19)**.

The location of Project 4 and its associated gen-tie lines contain generally low slopes of less than 1 percent gradient. As indicated in the Project description, development of the solar facility would not result in significant changes to existing site grades, and would not increase the susceptibility to slope failure. Additionally, the CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) does not identify Project 4 as being located in zones susceptible to landslides or slope failure. Therefore, the potential susceptibility for slope failure and landslides during construction and operation is less than significant for Project 4. **(DEIR at 4.6-20)**.

The soil series at the location of Project 4 and the Project 4 gen-tie line was indicated to be Greenfield sandy loam, Sunrise sandy loam, Ramona coarse sandy loam, and Hesperia sandy loam. These soil series have an erosion factor of 0.24 to 0.32, indicating a low to medium susceptibility to water erosion, and a wind erodibility group of 3, indicating a low to medium susceptibility to wind erosion. Implementation of appropriate erosion and sediment control BMPs will be implemented during construction and operation of Project 4, as outlined in Draft EIR Hydrology Section 4.9 and Air Quality Section 4.3, and will mitigate potential impacts to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.6-22)**.

Based on the information in the Geotechnical Critical Issues Analyses and Custom Soil Resource Reports prepared by Tetra Tech, the location of Project 4 and the Project 4 gen-tie line contains generally low gradient slopes. Development of solar facilities will not result in significant

changes to existing site grades, and will not increase the susceptibility to slope failure. Additionally, the CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) indicates that Project 4 is not susceptible to landslide or liquefaction hazards. **(DEIR at 4.6-24)**.

Although subsidence has occurred throughout the Antelope Valley, the majority of subsidence has been concentrated near the City of Lancaster and was caused by excessive groundwater pumping and decreased water levels. Subsidence in the vicinity of Project 4 was between 0 to 3 feet from 1930 to 1992, and there has been no surficial evidence such as fissures and differential settling observed near the Project 4 location. Based on historic rates of subsidence and a relatively stabilizing water level due to reduced pumping and proposed aquifer management, future subsidence is expected to be minimal. In the event that minor future subsidence does occur, the potential impact to the proposed structural design (post mounted racking systems and relatively small foundations for electrical equipment) would be minimal. Based on geologic data and the proposed construction and operation as described in the Project description, Project 4 impacts to on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-24, 25)**.

The soil series at the location of Project 4 and the Project 4 gen-tie line was indicated to be Greenfield sandy loam, Sunrise sandy loam, Ramona coarse sandy loam, and Hesperia sandy loam. This soil series is rated for a low shrink/swell potential, and the potential for expansive soils to affect Project 4 is less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-26)**. Project 4 does not propose the use of any sanitary facilities that will require septic tanks or sanitary wastewater disposal during either construction or operation. Therefore, no impact will occur. Project 4 is located on the floor of the Antelope Valley where the terrain is nearly flat. Project 4 is not located in the hillside area, and is not affected by Hillside Management Areas. **(DEIR at 4.6-26)**.

2.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Potential Effect:

Project 4 would have a significant impact related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change if it would: generate direct or indirect GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment, based on any applicable threshold of significance; or conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 4 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 4's short-term GHG emissions during the construction phase (maximum daily emissions of 11,208 pounds per day) would not exceed the AVAQMD significance threshold for maximum daily emissions (548,000 pounds per day). As such, Project 4 would not exceed thresholds or

result in violating GHG standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected GHG violation. **(DEIR at 4.7-21, 22)**.

Because construction of the six Project sites may overlap, concurrent construction emissions of Projects 1-6 were analyzed by emissions per year and thus compared to the annual GHG threshold of 100,000 metric tons of CO_{2e} per year, for long-term emissions. The unmitigated peak annual construction levels for all six Project sites are expected to result in annual GHG emissions below the most stringent annual threshold proposed by the AVAQMD (100,000 tons per year). As such, the Project will not exceed thresholds or result in violating GHG standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected GHG violation. **(DEIR at 4.7-23)**.

During operations, Project 4 facility operation would be limited to general maintenance, panel washing, and security. The primary source of emissions during operations is mainly the vehicles used by facility maintenance staff to and from the site. It is anticipated that operations and maintenance would utilize one water truck for panel washing and one light duty truck twice per year. Although Project 4 is scheduled for bi-annual panel washing, a maximum of ten trips were assumed for each Project (four round trips plus one additional round trip to be conservative). The operation emissions provided for each Project are considered the Project's baseline emissions, since it does not include any solar energy reductions. Because operations-related GHG emissions are considered long term, the AVAQMD daily significance threshold of 100,000 metric tons of CO_{2e} per year was used to analyze impacts during operations. The total annual operational emissions for Project 4 are 9.59 tons of CO_{2e} per year, which is well below the AVAQMD threshold of 100,000 tons per year. **(DEIR at 4.7-26)**. Likewise, concurrent operation of all six Projects is estimated to generate approximately 31 metric tons of CO_{2e} annually, which is well below the AVAQMD threshold. **(DEIR at 4.7-27)**.

Construction-related emissions from Project 4 would be temporary and finite in nature, below the applicable thresholds, and are consistent with the AB 32 Scoping Plan. Accordingly, Project 4's construction-related GHG emissions would not be a cumulatively considerable contribution to climate change. Project 4's operational GHG emissions would be negligible and would not comprise a cumulatively considerable contribution to climate change and, therefore, would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.7-28).**

Furthermore, with implementation of Project 4, there would be an added environmental benefit of displacing GHG emissions in the region. The solar energy generation would offset emissions from electricity usage, which would otherwise be produced by fossil-fueled power generation facilities using petroleum, natural gas, or coal combustion. Project 4 would result in a temporary increase in GHG emissions which is below the most stringent proposed threshold; employ active solar technologies supportive of the state's goals to reduce GHG emissions; and is consistent with the County of Los Angeles's goals. **(DEIR at 4.7-29)**.

Project 4 would therefore be in accordance with the state's need for the construction of renewable energy power plants to meet the state's GHG reduction objectives including:

- California's RPS that requires California's investor-owned electric utilities to obtain 20 percent of the electricity that they supply by 2010 from renewable sources;

- Executive Order S-14-08, which established the RPS targets for California that "all retail sellers of electricity shall serve 33 percent of their load with renewable energy by 2020";

- Executive Order S-03-05 on climate change to advance renewable energy and other solutions to reduce California's GHG emissions; and

- The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) that established a comprehensive program of regulatory and market mechanisms to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020.

Project 4 includes various project design features and objectives that address global climate change and reduce GHG emissions, as do each of the Projects 1-6. Project design features include aspects of the Project that either must be incorporated as part of the conditions of approval, or that the Applicant has committed to include to reduce GHG impacts associated with the Project. The Projects would be designed to reduce emissions through specific goals set. The expected Project features would directly or indirectly result in lower emissions of GHGs. The Project design features that address global climate change impacts include the following:

- Vegetation to sequester GHGs
    - Preserve natural areas by mowing, which maintains the organic material in the soil
    - Preserve open space by limiting constructing on portions of Project site
    - Plant trees and shrubs along the edges as buffers to adjacent receptors

- Construction limitations to minimize GHG emissions
    - Limit construction equipment idling beyond regulation requirements
    - Limit number of simultaneous construction projects by phasing

As such, Project 4 would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation to reduce GHG emissions. **(DEIR at 4.7-30)**. In addition to the Project design features listed above, the Project's impacts related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

GHG-1 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.

GHG-2 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not idle more than five minutes in any one hour.

GHG-3 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operations of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.

GHG-4 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.

GHG-5 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.

2.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Potential Effect:

Project 4 would have a significant effect on Hazards and Hazardous Materials if it would: create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment; emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses; be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; for a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires, due to location within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4); expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, due to location within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires due to location within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires due to location within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard; or constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 4 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 4 would not require extensive or ongoing use of hazardous materials. Hazardous materials used during the construction of Project 4 would be typical of most construction projects of this type. Hazardous materials used during construction activities may include gasoline, diesel fuel, oils, lubricants, solvents, detergents, degreasers, paints, and other supplies. All hazardous materials would be transported, stored, and properly disposed of in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. The accidental release of hazardous materials or wastes during construction activities is possible. The accidental release of hazardous materials or wastes would be promptly contained and abated in accordance with all applicable laws and regulatory requirements, and therefore is not expected to result in a significant impact. **(DEIR at 4.8-11)**. During operation of Project 4, limited quantities of hazardous materials would be stored on-site. These materials would include fire suppressant and transformer insulating oil (mineral oil). The mineral oil would be contained within Project 4 electrical transformers and switches. Project 4 would develop and implement a hazardous materials and hazardous waste management program for both construction and operational phases. The program would include the following, as required by applicable regulations. **(DEIR at 4.8-11)**.

- **Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste Handling:** The construction contractor would prepare a Project-specific hazardous materials management and hazardous waste management program for Project 4. This program would be implemented prior to the start of construction activities. The program would prescribe proper hazardous material use, storage, and disposal requirements, as well as hazardous waste management procedures. The program would identify specific types of hazardous materials to be used during Project 4 construction and operation, and specific types of wastes that will be generated. All personnel would be provided with Project-specific training. These programs would be developed to ensure that all hazardous materials and hazardous wastes would be handled and disposed of in a safe and environmentally sound manner consistent with all applicable laws and regulations. Employees and contractor personnel handling wastes would receive hazardous materials training and be trained in hazardous waste procedures, spill contingencies, waste minimization procedures and treatment, storage, and disposal facility ("TSDF") training in accordance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration ("OSHA") Hazard Communication Standard and 22 CCR. Prior to the start of construction of Project 4, a Hazardous Materials Business Plan ("HMBP") will be prepared and submitted in accordance with Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code and Title 22 CCR, as required by the Certified Unified Program Agency.

- **Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan:** The construction contractor would prepare a site-specific SWPPP for review and approval by the appropriate regulatory agencies and implement it prior to the start of demolition or construction activities at Project 4. The SWPPP would utilize BMPs to address the storage and handling of hazardous materials and sediment runoff during demolition and construction activities.

- **Transport of Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Wastes:** Hazardous materials transported by truck would include fuel (diesel fuel and gasoline) and oils and lubricants

for equipment. Transportation of hazardous waste may include hazardous building materials and small amounts of construction waste such as waste oils, solvents, or cleaners. The construction contractor would prepare written procedures for the transport of hazardous materials and hazardous waste in accordance with the California Vehicle Code, California Highway Patrol Regulations (CCR Title 13); Department of Transportation Regulations, Title 49, CFR; and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regulations, Title 40 CFR, and CCR 22 regulations prior to the start of construction activities at Project 4.

- **Fueling and Maintenance of Construction Equipment:** The construction contractor would prepare written procedures for the fueling and maintenance of construction equipment prior to the start of construction activities at Project 4. Vehicles and equipment would be refueled off-site or on-site by refueling trucks. If on-site refueling or maintenance activities are required, refueling and maintenance procedures would include implementation of BMPs to ensure that chemicals do not come in contact with the ground. Equipment will be inspected daily for potential leakage or failures.

- **Emergency Release Response Procedures:** The construction contractor would prepare an Emergency Release Response Plan ("ERRP") detailing the response to releases of hazardous materials. The ERRP would be prepared prior to the start of construction activities at Project 4. The ERRP would prescribe hazardous materials handling procedures for reducing the potential for a release during construction activities, and would include an emergency response program to ensure the rapid and safe cleanup of any accidental spills. All hazardous material spills of threatened release would be immediately reported. All construction and operations personnel would be aware of federal, state, and local emergency response reporting guidelines. Implementation of the aforementioned hazardous materials and hazardous waste management programs would reduce the potential impacts associated with the handling, transport, and use of hazardous materials during both construction and operation of Project 4 to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.8-12)**.

If lead based paint is found during construction of Project 4, the Applicant would comply with County requirements and provide a copy of the qualifications/license of the lead based paint abatement contractor that will perform the abatement or removal of lead based paint to the Department of Public Works Building and Safety Division and the County of Los Angeles Fire Department Health and Hazardous Materials Division. If required by the County, the Applicant would prepare and submit a Hazardous Building Materials Demolition Assessment and Management Plan to the Department of Public Works and Fire Department for review and approval to ensure compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local laws, and regulations. OSHA regulations are in place to assure that these materials are safely removed prior to or during demolition and renovation activities. In compliance with regulations requiring removals by firms and individuals licensed to do such work pursuant to applicable regulations the Project's potential impacts regarding lead exposure would be less than significant. Implementation of the aforementioned ERRP would reduce the potential impacts associated with upset and accidental release conditions at Project 4 (and gen-tie lines) to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.8-13)**.

Project 4 would convert sunlight directly into electrical energy without the creation of hazardous emissions, and no impact to sensitive land uses would occur as a result of hazardous emissions. The primary emissions created by Project 4 (and gen-tie lines) would be air emissions from vehicle and equipment exhaust generated during construction activities. Potential impacts due to air emissions created during construction and maintenance activities at Project 4 would be less than significant, as discussed in Section 4.3 of the DEIR. **(DEIR at 4.8-13)**.

Based on the Environmental Data Review ("EDR"), the location of Project 4 and the Project 4 gen-tie line is not located at a known site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites complied pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5; however, RECs indicated to be in the vicinity of Project 4 include an underground storage tank ("UST") and a clandestine drug lab. No known releases have occurred at Project 4 or adjacent to Project 4. Based on the information compiled in the EDR, Project 4 would have no impact due to site hazards to the public and environment during construction or operations. **(DEIR at 4.8-15)**.

Project 4 is not located within an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public use airport. Therefore, Project 4 would have no impact on public use airports. **(DEIR at 4.8-15)**. Project 4 and the Project 4 gen-tie line is located approximately 0.15 miles from Bohunks Airpark, which is a privately-owned dirt airstrip. Bohunks Airpark has not adopted a land use plan. Project 4 is not expected to significantly alter surrounding land use or result in the construction of features greater in height than those already present in the surrounding areas. The solar generating facilities would introduce minimal amounts of glare to the existing landscape. The PV modules are designed to absorb sunlight, and the glass modules that protect the PV surface are typically formulated glass designed to allow sunlight to pass with minimal reflection. Construction activities would be limited to daylight hours and any lighting that may occur would be in compliance with the requirements of the Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Therefore, the Project 4 impacts on people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airstrip would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.8-16, 17)**.

Emergency response and evacuation procedures for Project 4 would be coordinated by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department ("LACSD") and the Los Angeles County Fire Department ("LACFD"). During Project 4 construction activities, the LACSD and LACFD require that adequate vehicular access be provided and maintained. The Traffic Control Plan for Project 4 would provide for the required access of emergency vehicles during construction activities. During operation of Project 4, Project operation staff would work with both the LACSD and the LACFD to ensure adequate emergency procedures are in place. The HMBP would include an Emergency Response Plan. Additionally, an Emergency Action Plan and a Fire Prevention Plan would be prepared for Project 4 as required by Cal/OSHA. These plans would ensure that Project 4 would have established plans and procedures for responding to emergency situations, and would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, Project 4 impacts to emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans would be less than significant during both construction and operations. **(DEIR at 4.8-17)**.

Project 4 is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. No impact would occur in this regard. **(DEIR at 4.8-17)**. A public water system for fire control does not exist near Project

4. The facility design includes a dedicated 10,000-gallon fire water storage tank to be installed and maintained at Project 4, in compliance with LACFD Regulation 19 and other applicable Fire Department water tank specifications. Because the SGF design includes a dedicated fire water tank meeting Fire Department requirements, the water and pressure would meet fire flow needs. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.8-18)**.

Project 4 is surrounded by rural agricultural lands with no industrial uses, manufacturing uses, or other particularly high fire hazard uses in the vicinity. Project 4 would comply with all applicable Fire Code and County and City ordinance requirements, and fire safety standards, as stated in DEIR Section 4.12 Public Safety. A Fire Management Plan, which would be prepared for Project 4, establishes standards and practices that would minimize the risk of fire and, in the event of fire, provide for immediate suppression and notification. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(DEIR at 4.8-18)**.

Project 4 will convert sunlight into electrical energy through a process which would not constitute a fire hazard. All materials and equipment used in the construction of each facility would be specified based on applicable codes and building regulations. Welding activities may also potentially result in the combustion of brush and vegetation. A Fire Protection and Prevention Plan would reduce these potential impacts to less than significant. A Fire Prevention Plan would be prepared for Project 4 as required by Cal/OSHA, and Project 4 would include a dedicated 10,000- gallon fire water storage tank in compliance with LACFD Regulation 19. Therefore, Project 4 does not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard, and would have a less than significant impact on fire hazards in the area. **(DEIR at 4.8-19)**.

Project 4 impacts related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

HH-1 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Materials Management and Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.

HH-2 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.

HH-5 Construction activities shall be halted if previously unidentified soil contamination is observed or indicated by testing during any earthwork activities. Construction will be halted or redirected until such soil contamination is evaluated and disposed of and/or treated.

2.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Project 4 would have a potentially significant impact on Hydrology and Water Quality if it would: violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; 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; substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; 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; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality; conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52); result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance; use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course); otherwise substantially degrade water quality; 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, or within a floodway or floodplain; place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain; 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; or place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 4 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

A Notice of Intent form would be submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board ("SWRCB") to apply for coverage under the NPDES General Permit for construction of Project 4. During construction, Project 4 would implement BMPs as specified in the site-specific SWPPP. The SWPPP would be developed by a State of California certified Qualified SWPPP Developer ("QSD") and during construction monitored by a State of California certified Qualified SWPPP Practitioner ("QSP"). The SWPPP would be approved by the County and uploaded to the State via the State SMARTs system prior to Project 4 ground-breaking. The SWPPP would identify construction-phase BMPs to be implemented. With implementation of the BMPs, Project 4 and its associated gen-tie lines would only have the potential to generate less than significant effects on groundwater and/or stormwater runoff, and will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during construction. **(DEIR at 4.9-34; 4.9-38)**.

During Project 4 operations, mechanical equipment on the solar farm would either be made of pollutant free materials or fitted with special containment units to house any possible drips or

spills of lubricants, oils, or other chemicals. Maintenance activities, including solar array washing, would be performed with clean water and allowed to evaporate or drip to the ground. Maintenance and operations personnel would be required to maintain all necessary spill prevention, control, and countermeasures on hand during site visits. These spill response kits would include, but are not limited to, personal protective equipment, spill pads, absorbents, booms, shovels, garbage bags, plastic sheeting, and disposal drums. Permanent treatment BMPs would include infiltration basins to preserve water quality. With these spill prevention, control, and countermeasures on-site, there would be a less than significant impact on groundwater and stormwater runoff quality, and Project 4 will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during operation. **(DEIR at 4.9-34; 4.9-38).**

As stated in Section 4.14.5 of the DEIR, water would be required for dust control measures during the duration of construction efforts. An analysis of the water supply, including the use of well water, is presented in DEIR Section 4.14 Utilities and Service Systems. At the outset of construction, water would be supplied via truck to meet the demands of Project 4. Well water is not considered available at this time, and would be reevaluated upon a change in status. The demands of Project 4 are anticipated to have a less than significant impact on the region's groundwater supplies. Furthermore, construction activities are not anticipated to interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. As stated in Section 4.14.5 of the DEIR, water may be required in the first few years of operation to establish the mature vegetation planted after construction. Similar to the construction period, water would be supplied via truck to Project 4. The volume of water required would be considerably less than the water required for construction activities. Well water would be considered if its availability changes. As with construction, impacts to the region's groundwater supplies are anticipated to be less than significant with operation of Project 4. Also, the effect on groundwater recharge by the development's increase in impervious surface will be mitigated by the proposed infiltration basins. These infiltration basins will allow the increase in runoff volume from the proposed development (up to the 25-year storm event) to infiltrate on-site and recharge the groundwater basin. Therefore, less than significant impacts to groundwater recharge are anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-35)**.

During construction of Project 4 and its associated gen-tie lines, soils would be disturbed through activities such as minor grading and vegetation removal, which could lead to issues with soil erosion and siltation on- and off-site. Through the implementation of construction control measures per California Association of Stormwater Quality Agencies ("CASQA") standards (silt fencing, fiber rolls, and sandbag barriers), Project 4 would have less than significant impacts on erosion and debris deposition during construction (CASQA 2003). Project 4 and its associated gen-tie lines would require minor grading on-site which would not drastically change the existing drainage patterns or natural channels. Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan ("SUSMP")/Low Impact Development ("LID") Reports would help account for the increase in runoff erosion capabilities resulting from the developments' increase in impervious surfaces. The infiltration basins would help reduce flow velocities and the sediment load of the runoff, which would lower the erosion and siltation capabilities of the runoff. Therefore, Project 4 would result in less than significant impacts to erosion and siltation on- and off-site. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Project 4 and its associated gen-tie lines would require minor grading on-site, which would not drastically change the existing drainage patterns or natural channels. The increase in runoff flow rates and volumes from the developments' increase in impervious surfaces would be addressed by Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7. The infiltration basins, created by elevated road sections, would capture the increase in runoff volume (up to the 25-year storm event) and allow it to infiltrate on-site. The remaining runoff would flow over the road section and return to pre-development flow conditions before leaving the project site. With this measure, less than significant impacts would occur related to flooding on- and off-site. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7 would address the increase in runoff flow rates and volumes from the developments' increase in impervious surfaces. The infiltration basins, created by elevated road sections, would capture the increase in runoff volume (up to the 25-year storm event) and allow it to infiltrate on-site. The remaining runoff would flow over the road section and return to predevelopment flow conditions before leaving the Project site. The basins would be placed within the first half of the site to allow flows over the roads sections enough time to normalize before leaving Project 4. Project soils would treat the captured runoff at the infiltration basins. Therefore, less than significant impacts to existing or planned stormwater drainage systems are anticipated. Also, significant impacts to polluted runoff are not anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Project 4 and its associated gen-tie lines would incorporate Los Angeles County LID standards, while following the requirements of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works ("LACDPW"). Existing on-site drainage patterns and channels would not be significantly altered by the Projects' minimal grading, and all off-site drainage patterns and channels would not be significantly impacted either. Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7 would allow the developments' increase in runoff (up to the 25-year storm event) to be both infiltrated and treated on-site. This also minimizes downstream impacts by returning to predevelopment flow conditions. Therefore, Project 4 will not conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance. **(DEIR at 4.9-38)**.

Project 4 and its associated gen-tie lines are not in the vicinity of any SWRCB-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated. During construction, wastewater treatment systems would not be necessary. The Projects would contract services to supply and maintain portable toilets. Therefore, the impacts of Project 4 to the quality of groundwater and surface water would be less than significant during construction. The same portable toilet services would be contracted for operations. Temporary portable toilet services would be delivered during the required maintenance periods on an as needed basis. As a result, there would be less than significant impacts to the water quality of groundwater and surface water during Project 4 operations. **(DEIR at 4.9-39)**.

Project 4 is located within a 100-year flood hazard area. Some of the proposed infiltration basins within the Project 4 site, created by elevated road sections, cross the 100-year flow areas. Once full, runoff will flow over the elevated road section. These basins have been placed in the first half of the Project 4 site, to allow the flows to normalize and return to their pre-development sheet flow condition before leaving the site. Therefore, the proposed basins will not significantly

impede or redirect the flood flows. **(DEIR at 4.9-40)**. Project 4 does not involve the construction of housing. Therefore, no housing will be placed within a 100-year flood hazard area, and no impacts are anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-39)**.

Project 4 and its associated gen-tie lines are not within the immediate vicinity of any levees or dams which would place people or structures at risk of significant loss, injury or death in the event of a failure. In the event of a failure of the aqueduct near Project 4, the distance between the site and the aqueduct would allow the flow to dissipate. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated. Project 4 has slopes that very mild, at less than two percent. Therefore, high mudflow conditions are not anticipated. Accordingly, Project 4 will not place structures in an area subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow. **(DEIR at 4.9-40)**.

Project 4 impacts related to Hydrology and Water Quality are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

HYDRO-1 Education and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants and Employees. Appropriate educational materials and training for preventing stormwater pollution and additional BMP Fact Sheets from the California Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks can be found at www.cabmphandbooks.com. Practical information material will be provided to employees on general good housekeeping practices. These materials will describe, but are not limited to, spill prevention and control and the use of chemicals, petroleum products, pesticides and fertilizers that should be limited to the property, with no discharge of wastes directly or indirectly to gutters, catch basins or the storm drain system. Information will be distributed directly to the employees as well as being posted in public areas. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities. The required materials shall be available at each project site and a log kept to show education has occurred prior to the start of construction.

HYDRO-2 A spill contingency plan will be prepared by the owner/building operator. As a minimum the Spill Contingency Plan will "mandate the stockpiling of cleanup materials, notification of responsible agencies, disposal of cleanup materials and documentation." This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-3 No hazardous materials are anticipated to be stored on-site. If hazardous materials are required to be stored on-site, a designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in accordance with requirements of the Health & Safety Code and store the materials according to applicable regulations. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-4 A designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in compliance with the current requirements of the County of Los

Angeles Fire Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-5 Site waste receptacles shall be emptied on a weekly basis or more often to prevent containers from overflowing. Upon inspection any debris or rubbish will be picked up and the site cleaned. The trash area is NOT to be cleaned by hosing down. The type of materials used to clean the area and storage of said materials will be determined by the Contractor. Signage will be posted that lids shall be kept closed at all times. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 at all times during facility operations.

2.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Potential Effect:

Project 4 would have a significant effect related to Land Use and Planning if it would: physically divide an established community; be inconsistent with applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to, the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans; be inconsistent with the zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject properties; or conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria.

Finding:

Project 4 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Land Use and Planning. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 4 is located within a sparsely populated area, and is not located within any established community. The closest established community is Antelope Acres, which is located approximately 1.4 miles north of Project 3, the nearest of the six Project sites. Project 4 is located in an area that has been characterized by agricultural uses for several decades, and has been in transition to residential uses or vacant land. Project 4 would not physically alter the community, would not divide any community, or change any public access routes to them. Impacts would be considered to be less than significant. Likewise, Project 4's proposed gen-tie lines would not result in physical improvements that would result in dividing an established community, and the proposed gen-tie line would be located within a public right-of-way or an easement on private land. Therefore, Project 4 would not divide an established community, and impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.10-36)**.

Project 4 is not located within the boundaries of a Community Standards District; therefore, no district development standards apply to Project 4. The Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan designates the Project 4 site as N-1, Non-Urban use. According to the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, allowable uses in the N-1 designation include utility installations (County of Los Angeles 1986). Project 4 is considered a utility installation, and therefore would be consistent

with the N-1 land use designation. As a result, Project 4 would be consistent with the General Plan Land Use designation. Development of Project 4 will be consistent with permissible uses associated with the land use designation and the policies, goals, and objectives outlined in the Los Angeles County General Plan and the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, and will not be inconsistent with any applicable County plan. **(DEIR at 4.10-36)**.

The gen-tie lines for Project 4 are linear infrastructure that would not result in any changes to the existing land use patterns in the area of Project 4. The gen-tie lines would be located underground within Los Angeles County to the extent practicable, and aboveground within the City of Lancaster, either in a public road ROW or on private lands adjacent to the public road ROW. Within the City of Lancaster, the gen-tie line routes would traverse land use designations "NU" Residential and "UR" in the City of Lancaster. According to the County's Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, allowable uses in the N-1 designation include utility installations. Additionally, the City's NU land use designation permits solar generating facilities and utility installations within its designation. In July 2013, the City approved a General Plan Amendment for the UR designation to NU designation for another applicant's solar project that the gen-tie line would traverse to connect to the Antelope Substation. A franchise agreement will be obtained by the Applicant with the City of Lancaster for the gen-tie line that will traverse through this jurisdiction. This agreement will grant a utility franchise and right of way privileges for the proposed gen-tie line. Therefore, no impact to County and City Plans would occur**.** **(DEIR at 4.10-37)**.

The Project 4 site and its associated gen-tie line would not be located within the Fox Airfield's airport influence area ("AIA"). **(DEIR at 4.10-37)**.

The County's CUP entitlement process involves the discretionary review of a project, whereby conditions of approval for Project 4 would be assigned. A CUP Burden of Proof is required to be submitted to determine Project 4's consistency with the General Plan, compatibility with surrounding land uses, conditions to ensure compatibility, land suitability and physical constraints, project design, availability of adequate access, public services and facilities to serve the development, and identify potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures. As shown in DEIR Tables 4.10-1, 4.10-2, and 4.10-3, Project 4 is consistent with County land use designations and compatible with adjacent and surrounding land uses. **(DEIR at 4.10-43)**. The implementation of the environmental mitigation measures and CUP conditions would be expected to minimize Project 4's potential impacts, such that the Project could occur while maintaining zoning compliance within the designated zone. As a result, Project 4 would be consistent with the County's zoning designations. Permitting processes for those portions of the gen-tie lines located in the City of Lancaster would require necessary approvals from the City. Compliance with applicable City zoning regulations and conditions would ensure consistency with City's zoning designations. **(DEIR at 4.10-38)**.

Project 4 and lands adjacent to its associated gen-tie line ROW are located within the County's Heavy Agriculture (A-2) Zone. Project 4 is considered equivalent to an electric generating plant. Under the County zoning code for the A-2 zoning designation (Los Angeles County Code Section 22.24.150), electric generating plants and transmission substations are allowed in the A-2 zones with the issuance of a CUP. Lands adjacent to the gen-tie line for Project 4 would consist of the City's RR 2.5 Zone. The proposed gen-tie lines would be constructed underground within

Los Angeles County unless other applicable regulations require above-ground installation and aboveground or underground within the City of Lancaster. The gen-tie lines would be located on private lands adjacent to the public road ROW or within the public road ROW. They are linear facilities that would not result in any changes to the existing land use patterns in the Project 4 area, and would be permitted as part of respective County CUP and City permitting requirements. **(DEIR at 4.10-38)**. As a result, implementation of Project 4 and its associated gen-tie lines would be expected to be consistent with County and City zoning designations, and would result in a less than significant impact relative to the A-2 zoning in Los Angeles County and the RR 2.5 zoning in the City of Lancaster.

As discussed in DEIR Section 4.4 Biological Resources, Project 4 and its associated gen-tie lines are not located within a designated SEA; therefore, SEA conformance criteria do not apply. Project 4 and the area for its associated gen-tie lines contain generally low slopes of less than 1 percent gradient, and would not be located within or conflict with designated Hillside Management Areas. Therefore, no impacts would occur. **(DEIR at 4.10-39)**.

Project 4 is located within an Agricultural Opportunity Area, as discussed in Section 4.2 of the DEIR. Project 4 would generate electrical power through renewable solar PV technology which is an allowable use with a CUP. Project 4 would convert land that was formerly used for agricultural production, to renewable energy production. Construction and operation of Project 4 would not involve other restrictions, obstructions, or resources that could result in conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use. Additionally, Project 4 would be located on fallow land that is currently not irrigated, with surrounding parcels being mostly undeveloped and fallow agricultural land. Project 4 would produce power in a passive manner and would result in minimal air emissions, traffic, and noise, and would not affect adjacent agricultural operations. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(DEIR at 4.10-40)**.

Project 4 contains 113.7 acres of Prime Farmland and 43.4 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance; however, as discussed in DEIR Section 4.2 Agriculture and Forestry, these designations will be re-classified to “Grazing Land”. Once the designations are updated, Project 4 will have no impact to Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. **(DEIR at 4.10-40)**. Project 4 is not located within a Noise Management Area. **(DEIR at 4.10-41)**.

Portions of the Project 4 site are located within the 100-year (Zone A) and portions are located within the 500-year (Zone X, Shaded) floodplains. The Project 4 gen-tie line in its entirety would be located within the 500-year floodplain (Zone X, Shaded). All of the Project 4 site would be developed, and measures would be taken in the design of the site’s solar panels and gen-tie line, to account for the flood hazards. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(DEIR at 4.10-41)**.

2.11 NOISE

Potential Effect:

Project 4 would have a significant Noise impact if it would: result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise

ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the project; result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; for a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels; or, for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 4 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Noise.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Construction of Project 4 would take place between the second and fourth quarters of 2014. Sound generated from Project 4 would consist of: (1) short duration sounds resulting from construction activities, and (2) sound during normal facility operations. Vibration from Project 4 would only result during construction. Construction activities would take place only during daytime hours. An evaluation of expected noise and vibration levels was performed, and the ability of Project 4 to comply with applicable noise requirements was assessed.

The Draft EIR determined that the construction noise for Project 4 would be similar to that of Project 1; therefore, the Draft EIR's discussion of Project 4's noise impacts focused on the differences between Project 1 and Project 4, namely received sound levels at the nearest noise sensitive receptor. **(DEIR at 4.11-37)**. These Findings refer to certain facts from the Draft EIR's discussion of Project 1 noise impacts that are also applicable to Project 4.

For Project 4, the following criteria were determined to be inapplicable or to result in no impact:

- Exposure of on-site workers to noise levels that exceed occupational safety standards (90 dBA as a time-weighted 8-hour average or peak noise levels above 115 dBA).

- Exposure of residents to airport or private airstrip-related noise levels above a CNEL of 65 dBA.

Occupational noise exposure is governed by federal and state regulations. Cal/OSHA administers industrial safety regulations in California. Cal/OSHA regulations establish a time-weighted noise exposure limit of 90 dBA averaged over 8 hours (CCR, Title 8, Article 105). Noise source controls, administrative procedures, or worker hearing protection must be provided if worker noise exposure would exceed the 90 dBA limit. The construction contractor selected for the Project would be required to follow Cal/OSHA requirements for construction worker noise exposure. **(DEIR at 4.11-25; 4.11-30)**.

Sound from construction equipment would vary, depending on the construction phase and the number and class of equipment at a location at any given time. Actual received sound levels would fluctuate, depending on the construction activity, equipment type, and separation distances between source and receiver. **(DEIR at 4.11-30)**. Construction noise is a temporary noise source that would only occur during daytime hours. Sound levels from construction are expected to be comparable to sound produced by farm machinery, such as equipment used in nearby agricultural fields. Worst case construction noise levels for the nearest residence would last no more than a few weeks, as construction activities progress across Project 4. Therefore, no one residence would be exposed to significant noise levels for any extended period of time. **(DEIR at 4.11-27)**.

Sound from pile driving would attenuate to 94 dBA at the nearest residence to Project 4, and would attenuate to below 60 dBA within 1 linear mile of this construction activity, depending on meteorological and topographical effects. The average noise level from pile driving is predicted to be 71 dBA, similar to the level resulting at the Project centroid located 887 feet from the nearest residence. Because sound levels would be higher than 60 dBA at times, and up to 88 dBA at the closest residence, an exceedance of the County's construction noise level limits is anticipated. Therefore, where pile driving is planned to occur within 3,000 feet of an occupied noise sensitive receptor, an acoustic curtain or sound barrier with a sound transmission class of 19 or greater will be used to reduce received sound levels at the noise sensitive receptors to levels at or below the County's construction noise limit of 60 dBA. Pile driving is expected to last more than 10 days, and a variance from the County of Los Angeles noise ordinance will be required. **(DEIR at 4.11-38)**.

Traffic noise generated during construction of Project 4 on and offsite would temporarily add to overall sound levels. As a general construction practice, functional mufflers would be maintained on all equipment to maintain noise levels as low as reasonably achievable. The Project 4 Applicant would make reasonable efforts to minimize noise resulting from construction activities, as described in Mitigation Measures N1 - N6. In sum, with mitigation measures implemented, including the use of sound curtains or barriers during pile driving, construction sound levels would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.11-27; 4.11-31)**.

The average vibration level generated by Project 4 construction activities will be 0.02 PPV, which would be just more than barely perceptible to humans. Similar to the noise from pile driving, vibration from pile driving would only last for a few weeks at most, and would move throughout the Project rapidly with no single noise sensitive receptor experiencing the peak 0.3 PPV for more than an few hours, which will be perceptible but will not damage structures. Therefore, exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels due to the construction of Project 4 and the gen-tie line will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.11-49)**.

General William J. Fox Airfield is located four miles from Project 4. Bohunk's Airpark is located 500 feet from Project 4, and Little Buttes Antique Airfield is located 4.3 miles from Project 4. Bohunk's Airpark and Little Buttes Antique Airfield both have very low use levels. No airfield noise contours have been developed for Bohunk's Airpark or Little Buttes Antique Airfield, but due to low operation levels and separation distance from Little Buttes Antique Airfield, sound levels are assumed to be below 55 dBA CNEL. Sound contours have been

produced for General William J. Fox Airfield; however, Project 4 is beyond the area included in the airport's land use compatibility plan (Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission 2004). As a result, no aviation land use restrictions are required. Additionally, Project 4 would not create residential land uses, and all Project features are outside of airport area of influence. Consequently, there are no impacts from airport-related noise. **(DEIR at 4.11-52)**.

Once operational, Project 4 would generate power using PV modules mounted in rows of parallel racks. The Project is anticipated to be unmanned during normal operation. Systems monitoring would be completed remotely and onsite staff would be limited to repair or cleaning of the PV modules. Maintenance staff would visit two times per year to clean the PV modules, seasonally to clear vegetation, and as needed to perform other general maintenance activities. **(DEIR at 4.11-35)**. Sound sources considered in the operational acoustic analysis include the inverters and transformers associated with the PV modules, the substation, and the transmission line. The principal sources of noise are the cooling-ventilation fans, the electrical components of the inverters and the step-up transformers at the on-site substations. Noise generated by this equipment would be less than significant. Gen-tie lines for Project 4 would be above ground, and could be a source of corona noise. However, because corona noise is typically attributed to higher voltage lines of approximately 345 kV and above, noise complaints from the Project's lower voltage transmission lines (66 kV) are not anticipated. Operational sound sources are all predicted to be less than 35 dBA at nearby noise-sensitive receptors, and would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.11-38 to 4.11-40)**.

Project 4 impacts related to Noise are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

N-1 Construction operations would not occur between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday, or at any time on Sunday with the exception of limited low-noise generating potential night work with Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning and Public Works approval.

N-2 Construction site and access road maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour shall be established and enforced during the construction period.

N-3 Electrically-powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, except for devices like trucks, loaders, dozers, and other heavy equipment.

N-4 Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far as practicable, and no closer than 1,000 feet, from noise-sensitive receptors.

N-5 The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells are prohibited except where required by OSHA or for safety or emergency warning purposes required by other regulatory agencies.

N-6 Project-related public address or music systems used on-site shall not be audible at any adjacent receptor.

N-7 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 which are in compliance with any applicable legally required equipment noise standards. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors) shall be equipped with shrouds and/or other noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment. Mobile sound barriers with a sound transmission class of 19 or greater will be used for pile driving on Projects where received sound levels at the nearest noise sensitive receptor are predicted to be above the County construction noise limit of 60 dBA during the day. With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may need to incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including:

N-8 Siting substations to achieve National Electrical Manufacturers Association ("NEMA") sound ratings at sensitive receptors as described in Section 4.11.5.2 not to be closer to the property line of sensitive receptors than the following distances for each individual project:

- Project 4 (two transformers) – 1,000 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 77 dBA

N-9 The Applicant shall use NEMA low noise rated transformer equipment which will achieve 10 dBA or greater noise reduction as compared to standard NEMA-rated transformers of a similar size and rated capacity to ensure that Project noise impacts would be less than significant.

2.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

Potential Effect:

Project 4 would have a significant impact on Public Services if it would create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection; sheriff protection; schools; parks; libraries, or other public facilities.

Finding:

Project 4 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Public Services. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 4 is located within the LACFD Battalion 11 service area. Station 112, which is 3.6 miles north of Project 4, is the jurisdictional station (i.e. the first-responder) to respond to incidents at the site. Additional fire stations within Battalion 11 (identified in DEIR Table 4.12-1) would also potentially be dispatched to respond to fire protection needs at the site. **(DEIR at 4.12-8)**.

During construction, workers would be temporary and would not be expected to relocate to the Project 4 area, as they would mostly be hired from the available local workforce, and would not be expected to result in significant changes to the local population; therefore, the construction of Project 4 is not anticipated to create significant changes to the local population that would increase the level of demand on fire protection services or that would increase the level of demand on the fire department services such that additional staff would be needed. **(DEIR at 4.12-8)**.

As discussed in DEIR Section 4.13, Transportation and Traffic, construction of Project 4 would not result in significant traffic impacts. However, Project 4 would involve construction of an underground 0.02-mile gen-tie across West Avenue J and an underground 0.02-mile gen-tie across 90th Street West. Transmission line construction would require work in the public road ROW, including limited encroachment into the traveled roadway. It is anticipated that the construction of the Project 4 gen-tie lines would only require partial street closures, which provide better emergency access than full street closures. It is proposed to require worksite traffic control plans, permits, and coordination with County departments regarding potential construction impacts to 90th Street West and West Avenue J. Additionally, the LACFD Fire Stations 84, 112, and 130 would be notified at a minimum of three days in advance of any street closures that may affect fire/paramedic responses in the area. In the event that Project 4 would require street closures, alternate route details (detour plans) and the schedule of closures would be submitted to the LACFD prior to construction. Implementation of TT-3 traffic mitigation measure would be expected to minimize potential effects to 90th Street West and West Avenue J such that the impact to LACFD access and response times would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-8, 9)**.

Based on the Applicant's commitment to conformance of construction activities at the Project 4 site and gen-tie line ROW to federal, state, and Los Angeles County ordinances for fire protection, and implementation of mitigation related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials, construction would not be expected to result in significant special fire problems or hazards. Additionally, construction traffic at the site would not be anticipated to have a significant impact on local intersections and road segments. Therefore, Project 4 impacts to LACFD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-9)**.

Operations activities at Project 4 would typically be associated with routine maintenance carried out on-site and along the associated gen-tie ROWs at periodic intervals by a small maintenance crew. These activities would not result in effects to LACFD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection during operations of Project 4; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. In addition, the Applicant would be required to pay taxes as per the Proposition E Special Tax and property tax assessments, which are allocated to the LACFD.

These taxes are designed to provide for potential increases in LACFD fire protection service demands to accommodate for new and existing developments. **(DEIR at 4.12-11).**

The Project 4 site is located within the LACSD Field Operations Region 1 service area. The Lancaster Station, which is approximately 8.6 miles east of Project 4, would likely be the first responder to incidents at the site. Currently the station maintains an officer-to-population service ratio of approximately 1 to 1,000. Project 4 does not involve any residential uses, and would not be considered to result in significant increases to population. During construction, workers would be temporary, and would not be expected to relocate to the area as they would mostly be hired from the available local workforce. The employees are planned to be hired from the available local workforce, and would not be expected to result in significant changes to the local population that would increase the level of demand on law enforcement services. **(DEIR at 4.12-13)**.

Sheriff services potentially required at Project 4 would likely include incidents of vandalism or theft. While these incidents would require sheriff services, they are not considered emergency response incidents, and as such would not affect emergency response times. As discussed in DEIR Section 4.13, Transportation and Traffic, construction of Project 4 would not result in significant traffic impacts, and any impacts associated with street closures due to installation of the underground gen-tie lines will be addressed through the use of worksite traffic control plans, permits, and coordination with County departments regarding potential construction impacts to 90th Street West and West Avenue J. Therefore, impacts from the construction of Project 4 to LACSD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for sheriff protection would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-13)**.

Project 4 and its associated gen-tie lines do not include residential development or the influx of long-term workers from outside the area, and accordingly would not generate population growth. Consequently, no new demands on school facilities, parks, library facilities or other public facilities are expected, and no impact would occur to these facilities. **(DEIR at 4.12-15; 4.12-16)**.

2.13 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Potential Effect:

Project 4 would have a significant impact on Transportation and Traffic if it would: conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit; 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; result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks; substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); result in inadequate emergency access; or conflict with adopted policies, plans or

programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 4 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Transportation and Traffic.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Traffic generated during the construction phase of Project 4 and its gen-tie line would include construction worker commuter trips, water truck trips, and delivery truck trips. Construction worker commuter trips and delivery truck trips are anticipated to arrive to the Project 4 site outside of peak hours. It is anticipated that 30 percent of water trucks would arrive to the Project site during the AM peak hour. Project 4 would have an average of 120 workers per day and a peak of 160 workers per day over a 30-day period during construction. For equipment and materials, Project 4 would have an average of 3 delivery truck trips per day with an expected peak of 26 delivery truck trips. It is anticipated that construction workers and delivery trucks would arrive to the Project 4 site outside of peak hours. **(DEIR at 4.13-33)**.

Dependent upon climatic conditions during construction, the maximum estimated water use for the Project 4 site during both Phase 1 and 2 of construction is 155 acre-feet, which would be obtained from an off-site provider. Potable water would be brought in to the Project 4 site for drinking and domestic needs. During the site preparation and grading activities, water would mainly be used for soil compaction and control of fugitive dust generation. Subsequent to these construction activities, water usage would primarily be used for on-going dust suppression associated with the remaining construction of the Project. Project 4 would require a total of 32 daily water truck trips arriving on-site. Assuming that 30 percent of the water trucks would arrive on-site during the AM peak hour (7:00 AM), 10 water trucks were used in this analysis. As shown in DEIR Tables 4.13-19 and 4.13-20, the local roads would experience a maximum increase in traffic volume of 40 percent during the AM peak hour. This is mainly due to the existing low volume and low peak traffic conditions for these roads, which are located in rural areas and operate well below the existing capacity of 1,600 vehicles per lane per hour for a 2-lane road. Therefore, it is concluded that these roads have adequate capacity to safely accommodate the increase from water truck traffic and would have a less than significant impact on the existing traffic conditions. **(DEIR at 4.13-34)**.

During construction of gen-tie lines associated with Project 4, it is anticipated that temporary, one-lane road closures would be necessary. A Project Traffic Plan would be prepared to address the temporary one-lane road closures and submitted to the County for approval prior to issuance/approval of the County Grading Permit, as indicated in Mitigation Measure TT-2. Parking, temporary office trailers, and construction and PV equipment lay-down areas would be located entirely within the Project 4 site boundary. The construction traffic impacts would be temporary, and less than significant with mitigation. **(DEIR at 4.13-34)**.

The operational phase of Project 4 is anticipated to only generate an average of 4 additional vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hours on a quarterly or as-needed basis with a

maximum of 12 additional trips, which would only occur when panel washing operations are being conducted. Based on the traffic analysis for the water truck trips described above, the operational phase vehicle trips are considered negligible. Therefore, no additional post-construction operational analysis was conducted. The operational phase of Project 4 would have a less than significant impact on the traffic and/or transportation infrastructure. **(DEIR at 4.13-35)**. Project 4 would not conflict with any applicable congestion management programs during the construction or operational phases. **(DEIR at 4.13-39)**.

Air traffic would not be impacted by Project 4. Project 4 would not include any buildings, structures, or other operations that would result in a change in existing air traffic patterns. The PV modules that would be used at the Project 4 site would be non-reflective and would not pose a hazard to air traffic. Gen-tie line components would be below the height limit and would not result in a change in existing air traffic patterns. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.13-39)**.

No existing roads would be altered by Project 4, and Project 4 does not include design features or uses that would substantially increase any hazards. Parking, temporary office trailers, and construction and PV equipment lay-down areas would be located entirely within the Project 4 site boundary. Only temporary one-lane road closures are expected for the construction of the Gen-tie Lines. A Project Traffic Plan would be prepared to address the temporary one-lane road closures and submitted to the County for approval prior to issuance/approval of the Grading Permit. Therefore, Project 4 would not result in inadequate emergency access. Project 4 is located in rural areas of Los Angeles County and would not significantly decrease the performance or safety of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. **(DEIR at 4.13-40)**.

Project 4 impacts related to Transportation and Traffic are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

TT-1 Prior to issuance of a grading permit, Applicant shall document and submit all required information and/or material pertaining to the pavement conditions of construction routes for the Projects, including the formula for calculation of the Projects' fair share of any repair or reconstruction of construction routes to the satisfaction of LACDPW. Applicant shall reimburse the County of Los Angeles for the cost of any repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes attributable to the Projects as agreed to by LACDPW. The timing of any necessary repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes and the required payment by the Applicant shall be determined by LACDPW.

TT-2 Prior to any construction activities and/or issuance of required encroachment permits from Los Angeles County, the Applicant shall prepare worksite traffic control plans for review and approval from LACDPW and other affected agencies for any closures, partial closures of public streets, or work within or adjacent to the road right-of-way that impacts the movement of traffic. The Plans shall be prepared in accordance with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (2012).

TT-3 Additionally, the County, including LACFD Fire Stations 78 (for R2011-00801) and 130 (for R2011-000798, 00799, 00805,00807, & 00833) shall be notified at least three days in

advance of any street closures that may affect fire and/or paramedic responses in the area. The Applicant shall provide alternate route (detour) plans to the County, including three sets to LACFD, with a tentative schedule of planned closures, prior to the beginning of construction.

TT-4 Stagger construction work shifts before or after peak traffic hours.

TT-5 Schedule truck deliveries during off peak hours.

TT-6 Limit water truck deliveries during the AM peak hour to 30 percent of the daily water truck trips. All other trips shall be at off peak hours.

TT-7 Prior to start of construction activities, Applicant shall provide worker education encouraging carpooling and vanpooling by workers and shall provide assistance for organizing vanpools and carpools. A log will be developed to show compliance.

2.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Potential Effect:

Project 4 would have a significant impact on Utilities and Service Systems if it would: exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards; create water or wastewater system capacity problems, 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; create drainage system capacity problems, 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; not have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses; create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; or create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Finding:

Project 4 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Utilities and Service Systems. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The construction of Project 4 and its associated gen-tie lines would generate temporary and limited wastewater as a result of on-site construction workers. The wastewater generated would

be collected at the on-site mobile sanitation facilities and then transported to a nearby wastewater disposal facility. In the event that additional wastewater is generated from construction activities, water would be stored in an on-site tank system and would be disposed of at an approved wastewater treatment facility. Construction and operational wastewater will be limited in quantity and significantly below wastewater treatment requirements of Los Angeles County and the RWQCB. **(DEIR at 4.14-14)**.

All wastewater would be treated according to the treatment requirements enforced by the NPDES permit authorized by the Lahonton Regional Water Quality Control Board ("LRWQCB"). Additionally, semi-annual washing of the PV modules would generate minimal wastewater during operation. However, since the wash water would only consist of demineralized water and dust washed off of the modules, it would not need to be treated at a wastewater treatment facility. This wash water would be allowed to infiltrate into the ground and evaporate as it drips off the PV modules. The wastewater generated from maintenance workers would be collected at the on-site temporary mobile sanitation facilities and then transported to a nearby wastewater treatment facility. Project 4 would not exceed the requirements of LRWQCB, and therefore impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-14)**. Likewise, construction and operation of Project 4 would not exceed the capacity of any treatment plant, and would have no impact to a wastewater system. Consequently, no new wastewater treatment facilities would need to be created and no existing facilities would need to be expanded. The maximum construction water use of Project 4 is 155 acre feet, and the maximum operational water use of Project 4 is 7.6 acre feet per year. No water system capacity problems would be created, and no new water systems or expansion of existing systems would be required. **(DEIR at 4.14-16, 17)**.

Project Site 4 currently drains from southwest to northeast; the post-development condition would maintain this flow path. A SWPPP incorporating BMPs for temporary stormwater management would be prepared and approved before the construction of Project 4 and its gen-tie lines. The final design of Project 4 would allow the pre-development runoff amount to continue to sheet flow in the post-development condition to avoid disturbance to downstream drainage structures or wildlife. The design of Project 4 would eliminate the need for new drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, Project 4 would have a less than significant impact on drainage facilities. **(DEIR at 4.14-18)**.

The construction for Project 4 and the Project 4 gen-tie lines would create a short-term temporary demand for water, primarily in association with dust control. The Applicant would provide a Dust Control Plan to the County prior to the start of construction activities. The plan would detail site-specific dust control measures designed to minimize water use during construction activities, while minimizing fugitive dust emissions. Project 4's maximum construction water use is 155 ac-ft. It is estimated that the Project 4 site would have potentially historically required at least 658 ac-ft of water per year for agriculture. Thus, the maximum construction water use of Project 4 is substantially less than the best estimate of water use of 658 AFY for agriculture, which was historically the primary land use of surrounding land. Based on potential estimated historic groundwater use at the site, there may be adequate groundwater supply within the western portion of the Basin to meet Project 4's construction water needs. In addition, according to the Antelope Valley Integrated Regional Water Management Plan

("IRWMP"), groundwater is considered a reliable water source in the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin.

However, given that the Adjudication will not likely be resolved during construction of Project 4, water for Project 4 would be supplied via truck from either Homer LLC, or the City of Lancaster, both of which have provided "Will Serve" letters indicating their ability to meet the water demands of Project 4. Homer LLC would provide out-of- Basin water stored in the Antelope Valley Water Bank. Potential recycled water providers are Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40, Los Angeles County Sanitation District, and Palmdale Water District. The City of Lancaster has a current supply capacity of approximately 16 million gallons per day of treated wastewater that is suitable for construction use and panel washing. **(Final EIR at p. 256)**.

As previously discussed, the potential estimated historical agricultural water usage for the Project 4 site was determined to be at least 658 AFY. Project 4's maximum construction water use is 155 ac-ft, which equates to 76.4 percent less than the potential estimated historical annual agricultural groundwater usage at the site. Either of the sources noted above would have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the Project 4 construction demands from existing water source entitlements and water resources. Therefore the impacts from water usage during construction would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-23)**.

During operations, the maximum water use for Project 4 would be 7.6 AFY, which equates to a little over 1 percent of the historical groundwater usage at the site. A maximum of 7.1 AFY of additional water may be needed in the first 2 years of operation to establish the plants for the landscaping buffer. It is unlikely, but possible that additional water (up to 7.1 AFY) may be needed later during the operations phase for supplemental plantings if landscape vegetation expires and has to be replaced. **(DEIR at 4.14-23)**. As with the Project 4 water needs during construction, during operations Homer LLC would also provide out-of-Basin water stored in the Antelope Valley Water Bank. This option would provide a reliable source of water for operations. Potential recycled water providers are Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40, Los Angeles County Sanitation District, and Palmdale Water District. The City of Lancaster has a current supply capacity of approximately 16 million gallons per day of treated wastewater that is suitable for construction use and panel washing. **(Final EIR at p. 256)**. Therefore, the impacts from water usage during operations would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-23)**.

Project 4 and its associated gen-tie lines do not require natural gas or propane during construction or operation; therefore there would be no system capacity problems for those utilities. Since natural gas and propane are not needed for Project 4, no new energy facilities would need to be created, and no existing facilities would need to be expanded. Project 4 may require electricity for the construction equipment and for lighting construction activities. The electricity would likely come from one of the existing SCE lines located on the west and south sides of the site. Electricity consumption during construction would be temporary, and would vary depending on the phase of construction. Overall, the construction of Project 4 would require limited electrical consumption that the existing electrical grid has capacity to serve. Therefore,

Project 4 would have a less than significant impact on energy utility system capacity during construction. **(DEIR at 4.14-25)**.

Project 4 would also require electricity for ongoing maintenance operations, lighting, security systems, and other various operational needs. During daylight hours, the electricity needs for Project 4 would be supplied by Project 4's electricity generation. During non-daylight hours, the electricity needs for Project 4 would be provided by either backfeed from the electrical grid, through the proposed gen-tie, or through the existing SCE lines located on the west and south sides of the Project 4 site. Therefore, Project 4 would have a less than significant impact on energy utility system capacity. **(DEIR at 4.14-26)**.

Construction of Project 4 would require some earthwork, demolition of two existing buildings, and installation of the SGF. Solid waste generated from construction of Project 4 and the Project 4 gen-tie lines may include paper, wood, glass, plastics from packing material, waste lumber, insulation, scrap metal and concrete, empty non-hazardous containers, and vegetation wastes. In accordance with Title 22 Chapter 22.52, 65 percent of construction and demolition debris would be recycled. Any material that cannot be recycled would be properly disposed of at a regional disposal facility. Any defective or broken solar modules would be returned to the manufacturer for recycling. In accordance with Title 22 Chapter 20.87, the Applicant would prepare a Recycling and Reuse Plan and progress reports to implement and document the Project's recycling practices. Therefore, Project 4 impacts on landfill and solid waste disposal capacity would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-27)**. Once the SGF is installed, there would be minimal waste generated during Project 4 operations; therefore Project 4 will have a less than significant impact on landfill and solid waste disposal capacity during operations. **(DEIR at 4.14-27)**.

Non-hazardous waste generated during construction, operation, and decommissioning of Project 4 (and gen-tie lines) would be transferred by licensed waste hauling contractors and recycled or disposed of in compliance with local and state regulations. Hazardous wastes would be shipped offsite and treated or disposed in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations for hazardous waste management. The construction contractor would prepare a Project-specific hazardous materials management and hazardous waste management program for Project 4. Project 4 would have no impact relative to compliance with existing federal or state regulations pertaining to solid waste, because Project 4 would be required to comply with all relevant regulations during construction, operation and decommissioning. **(DEIR at 4.14-27)**.

SECTION 3.0 FINDINGS REGARDING CUMULATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH ARE NOT SIGNIFICANT OR WHICH HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

Pursuant to Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines, the following findings and statements of fact identify potentially significant cumulative impacts and Project 4's incremental contribution to the impacts discussed in the Final EIR, in the context of the other five Projects and other cumulative projects. For the following environmental resource areas, Project 4's incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable, and no cumulatively significant impact will occur.

3.1 AESTHETICS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 4), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Aesthetics.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 4, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects. Project 4, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Aesthetics.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Individually, with mitigation, each of the six proposed SGF Projects can each be expected to have a less than significant impact on aesthetic resources. The Project sites comprise 987.1 acres, or 0.6 percent of the total area within the 5 mile radius. Within the 5-mile radius area, there are 20,909 acres of development listed by individual projects, as shown in DEIR Table 3-7. These development projects, including the Applicant's Projects, comprise 12.6 percent of the area identified in DEIR Figure 3-5 and include solar projects, commercial projects, and residential projects.

From elevated viewpoints, the western Antelope Valley appears as a mosaic of agricultural lands, suburban developments, and open land. From a distance, the proposed SGFs would not appear dissimilar to agricultural fields or existing PV facilities in shape and size. The other solar and real estate developments proposed for the western Antelope Valley would not appear dissimilar to existing land use patterns. From level viewpoints, such as those along local roads, solar or residential/commercial developments would not be prominent unless the observer is directly adjacent to the facility. Because of the flat nature of the Antelope Valley landscape, developments would quickly become less prominent as the viewer travels away from them. In addition, the scenic character on the valley floor is generally low. Existing commercial, residential, and energy developments (including substations, high-voltage transmission lines, distribution lines, and generation facilities) are scattered throughout the valley.

A 12.6 percent level of increase in development within 5 miles of each of the Project sites is not anticipated to be significant from elevated or level viewpoints, because the proposed developments would appear similar to existing developments in the Antelope Valley, and cover only a very small portion of the land within 5 miles of each proposed Project site. Views of open desert lands would still exist, and the flatness of the landscape would limit the prominence of new developments with increasing distance.

The proposed Projects and other proposed projects within the cumulative impacts study area would be individually required to comply with the Los Angeles County General Plan goals and policies, and the Antelope Valley Area Plan policies, as well as applicable ordinances such as the

Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance, as they are applicable to aesthetic resources, as identified in Section 4.1.3 of the DEIR. Any cumulative aesthetic impacts would be reduced to a level that is less than significant with mitigation by application of these regulations, and mitigation measures A-1 to A-5. **(DEIR at 4.1-114 to 4.1-115)**.

3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Cumulative impacts to Agriculture and Forestry Resources could occur in the event that Project 4, in conjunction with the six proposed SGF Projects and other cumulative projects results in the area results in a cumulatively significant loss of Important Farmlands or Williamson Act contracted lands.

Finding:

Project 4, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Agriculture and Forestry Resources. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see DEIR Table 3-7). For the purposes of this cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable law ordinances regulations and standards.

Projects 1 – 6 are located in a region with significant agricultural uses. However, the Antelope Valley has been historically and is currently limited by water costs and climate conditions. Cumulatively, the Projects would not develop land classified as Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Project 4 is the only site that currently contains land designated as Prime Farmland and of Statewide Importance. As mentioned above, the DOC is in process of reclassifying Project 4 land currently mapped as Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance to Grazing Land on the 2012 edition of the Important Farmland Map for Los Angeles County. The Projects would not be expected to contribute to the overall trend of conversion of agricultural lands to other uses in the Antelope Valley when considered together with other potential cumulative projects in the area. That said, it is contemplated that at the end of the anticipated 35-year life of Projects 1-6, the associated properties could be returned to agricultural use. The Projects' incremental contribution to cumulative agricultural impacts is considered less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-9)**.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 4), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Air Quality.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 4, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Air Quality. Project 4, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Air Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Twenty-nine related projects have been identified within the proposed Projects' vicinity; locations are listed in DEIR Figure 4.3-2, "Cumulative Projects in the Region". Of these 29 related projects, there are a number of related projects that have not yet been built or are currently under construction. Since the Applicant has no control over the timing or sequencing of the related projects, and the level of emissions that would be generated by the related projects is uncertain, it is infeasible and speculative to prepare a quantitative analysis to ascertain daily construction emissions that would occur under a worst-case scenario of all 29 related projects being constructed concurrently with the Applicant's six Projects.

For this reason, the AVAQMD was consulted to assess the cumulative impact resulting only from the Applicant's six Projects. The County's EIR consultant (Tetra Tech) met with AVAQMD officials and technical staff at the AVAQMD's office on May 29, 2012, and discussed the proper cumulative Air Quality analysis methodology for the Project pursuant to CEQA. **(DEIR at 4.3-48)**. AVAQMD determined that cumulative impacts from the Applicant's six Projects should be cumulatively quantified based on size, construction equipment per phase, and construction phase duration, and that the related projects should only be qualitatively discussed within the EIR. The cumulative Air Quality analysis was performed based on the direction from AVAQMD, and included the analysis of concurrent construction and operation emissions sources on any one maximum construction day, air dispersion modeling method, and risk assessment method. **(DEIR at 4.3-48)**.

As previously discussed in the analyses above (DEIR Table 4.3-13, "Peak Annual Construction Emissions"; DEIR Table 4.3-20, "Peak Annual Operation Emissions"; and DEIR Table 4.3-22, "Concurrent Health Risk Assessment"), emissions from overlapping construction phases of the Applicant's six projects would not exceed the AVAQMD thresholds on any maximum day or year during construction or operations. **(DEIR 4.3-30; 4.3-49)**.

With respect to the Project's construction-period air quality emissions and cumulative Basin-wide conditions, the AVAQMD has developed strategies to reduce criteria pollutant emissions outlined in the Air Quality Management Plan ("AQMP") pursuant to CAA mandates. As such,

Project 4 would comply with AVAQMD Rule 403 requirements, and implement all feasible mitigation measures. In addition, Project 4 would comply with adopted AQMP emissions control measures. Per AVAQMD rules and mandates and the CEQA requirement that significant impacts be mitigated to the extent feasible, these same requirements (i.e., Rule 403 compliance, the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, and compliance with adopted AQMP emissions control measures) would also be imposed on construction projects Basin-wide, which would include each of the related projects mentioned below. **(DEIR 4.3-49)**.

By applying AVAQMD's cumulative air quality impact methodology, implementation of Projects 1 – 6 would not result in an addition of pollutants, such that considerable cumulative impacts in conjunction with related projects in the region would occur. Therefore, the emissions of nonattainment pollutants and precursors generated cumulatively by Projects 1 – 6 would be less than significant. Projects are deemed inconsistent with air quality plans when they result in population and/or employment growth that exceeds growth estimates in the applicable air quality plan. The SGF sites would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, which in this case is the Federal 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan (Western Mojave Desert Nonattainment Area). The Ozone Attainment Plan relies upon future year emission inventories consistent with California Air Resource Board ("CARB") and the adopted General Plan growth projections. As the proposed Projects are not part of an ongoing regulatory program, the AVAQMD recommends Project-specific air quality impacts be used to determine the potential cumulative impacts to regional air quality. As discussed above, peak daily emissions of operation-related pollutants would not exceed AVAQMD significance thresholds.

The combined Projects' emission estimates state that while Projects 1 – 6 would generate air emissions during construction and a minimal amount of GHG emissions during operations, the Projects' incremental contribution, with mitigation, to cumulative air quality impacts do not exceed any air quality significance thresholds and would comply with the applicable AVAQMD AQMP. It should be noted that solar energy provided by the Projects is a much cleaner source of energy than traditional sources used for the generation of electricity, such as the burning of coal, fuel oil, or natural gas. Furthermore, since the percentage of GHG emissions generated by Projects 1 – 6 is so small; Projects 1 – 6 would provide a *de minimis* contribution to significant cumulative impacts caused by other projects in the region (as further discussed in DEIR Section 4.7, Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas). The Projects' emissions of non-attainment pollutants and precursors generated during operations with mitigation would not exceed the AVAQMD Project-level thresholds and are less than significant. As a result, Project-level emissions would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution, such that results in an increase in air pollutant emissions above those assumed in the regional AQMP. **(DEIR at 4.3-52)**.

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 4), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Biological Resources.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 4, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Biological Resources. Project 4, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Biological Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The total area included in the map in DEIR Figure 3-17 showing a 5.0 mile radius outward from each of the Project 1 – 6 solar sites comprises 165,349 acres. Solar development in the area is 8,086 acres (4.9 percent of the 165,349 acres shown in DEIR Figure 3-17). The Silverado Projects cover 987 acres (only 0.6 percent of the total area). Open space and wildlife mitigation lands would be acquired and preserved in perpetuity for Projects 1 – 6. Since the mitigation lands are intended to comprise higher quality wildlife habitat than those impacted by the Projects, impacts will be mitigated. The permanent nature of the land mitigation and preservation program to be implemented would assure that these new wildlife habitat mitigation lands would always be maintained and enhanced for wildlife values. Therefore, cumulative impacts from the Project would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.4-71)**.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 4), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Cultural Resources.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 4, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Cultural Resources. Project 4, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Cultural Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. As described above under impacts specific to Project 4, impacts related to cultural resources would be mitigated to less than significant levels, since the CRHR and NRHP eligible resources in the area would be avoided. Because impacts to cultural resources would be mitigated to less than significant through avoidance, Projects 1 – 6 would not result in an incremental increase in effects on cultural resources when combined with the other

29 projects. Therefore, no significant cumulative impacts would be expected to occur. **(DEIR at 4.5-35)**.

3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 4), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Geology and Soils.

Finding:

Project 4, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Geology and Soils. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). For the purposes of this cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time.

It is assumed that construction of all of the cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards, and that geotechnical studies would be performed to assess and mitigate any geotechnical hazards associated with them; therefore, the cumulative projects would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects. It is also assumed that the cumulative projects would comply with all applicable erosion control and stormwater management laws, ordinances, regulations and standards, therefore the construction of the cumulative projects would not contribute to cumulative soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

Proposed Projects 1 – 6 would not expose the public to adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking because the Projects would be contained within a secure fenced area at each location and not open to the public. The potential for injury to workers is also quite low as they will not be on-site the majority of the time, and the likelihood that a seismic event would occur when workers are present is quite small. The Projects would also not result in significant soil erosion because the design and construction of the Projects' facilities would comply with all applicable building codes and standards established by regulatory agencies, including Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the CBC. The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would therefore not contribute incrementally to cumulative impacts resulting from other development within the 5-mile radius. **(DEIR at 4.6-27)**.

3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 4), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 4, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change. Project 4, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15355, a "cumulative impact" is an environmental effect that may result from the combination of two or more environmental effects associated with a proposed project, or from the combination of one or more project environmental effects with related environmental effects caused by other closely related projects. However, in the case of global climate change, the proximity of the Projects to other GHG-generating activities is not directly relevant to the determination of a cumulative impact. Although AB 32 sets statewide targets for future GHG emissions, the scoping plan and other implementing tools of the law are clear that the reductions are not expected to occur uniformly from all sources or sectors. The conclusions related specifically to Project 4, above, highlights the manner by which the proposed Projects intend to meet many of these strategies.

Numerous options exist for project developers to reduce their contribution to city-, county-, and state-wide GHG emissions, while helping to meet the region’s future housing, jobs, and infrastructure needs. However, it is not possible at this time to accurately quantify GHG emissions expected from the related Projects or the GHG reductions anticipated from the above-listed strategies. There is no certain basis for concluding that an emissions increase resulting from the Projects and the related Projects could cause a measurable increase in global GHG emissions sufficient to force global climate change due to the complex physical, chemical and atmospheric mechanisms involved in global climate change.

In addition, the emissions models used for Project-level evaluations do not fully reflect improvements in technology and other reductions in GHG emissions that are likely to occur pursuant to state regulations, such as AB 1493, SB 1368, AB 32, and Executive Order S-3-5, as well as future federal and/or state regulations. Therefore, it is not possible or meaningful to calculate emissions from each of the identified related Projects and compare that with a numeric threshold or reduction target. Projects 1-6 would be consistent with the state’s goals in helping the state meet the RPS (DEIR Table 4.7-17), resulting in a GHG emission profile that is below established thresholds, and include implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-1 to GHG-5.

Therefore, the Projects do not contribute considerably to cumulatively significant global climate change impacts. **(DEIR at 4.7-31)**.

3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 4), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 4, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Project 4, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see Table 3-7). For the purposes of this cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. It is assumed that for each of the cumulative projects, Hazardous Materials Management Plans and Hazardous Waste Management Plans would be implemented, a SWPPP would be prepared, and all applicable environmental due diligence would be conducted (i.e., a Phase I ESA). If any of the cumulative projects are within an airport land use plan or airport influence area, the projects would obtain the appropriate authorizations and permitting from the respective Airport Land Use Commission. The cumulative projects would have a less than significant impact with mitigation to hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the land uses in the surrounding areas (primarily agricultural) and the limited amount and type of hazardous materials to be used as part of the proposed Projects 1 – 6, no significant incremental cumulative impacts associated with environmental safety are expected to occur as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed Projects 1 – 6. Regulations implemented by the Department of Toxic Substance Control ("DTSC"), LACSD, LACFD, and Cal/OSHA would require similar measures be applied to other developments in the region. Therefore, Projects 1 – 6 are not expected to result in significant incremental cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. **(DEIR at 4.8-19 to 4.8-20)**.

3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 4), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 4, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Hydrology and Water Quality. Project 4, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Project sites, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-3). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws ordinances regulations and standards. Projects located within 5 miles of the proposed Projects entail the geographic extent under consideration of cumulative impacts. The proposed Projects are six of several proposed renewable development projects that would impact existing and proposed land uses within the general Project area. As shown in DEIR Table 3-7 and DEIR Figure 3-17, the proposed Projects would entail approximately 0.60 percent of all proposed projects within a 5-mile radius.

All cumulative projects that may be approved and implemented would also assess potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality. The proposed Projects 1 – 6 were found to have less than significant impacts related to erosion, flooding, debris deposition, and stormwater quality, with no off-site impacts. Additionally, the proposed Projects would not result in any significant or unavoidable impacts and represent a small fraction of the total amount of lands affected by renewable projects and foreseeable projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects. Therefore, the proposed Projects would not be expected to significantly contribute to potential cumulative impacts associated with other projects in the Projects' region. **(DEIR at 4.9-45)**.

3.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 4), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Land Use and Planning.

Finding:

Project 4, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Land Use and Planning. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6. The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards. **(DEIR at 4.10-43)**.

Projects located within 5 miles of the proposed Projects entail the geographic extent under consideration of cumulative impacts. The proposed Projects are six of several proposed renewable development projects that would impact existing and proposed land uses within the general Project area. Similar potential impacts can result from these projects as from the Projects with respect to consistency with the subject general plan land use plans and policies, impacts to compatibility with surrounding land uses, and regulatory compliance with zoning ordinances. All cumulative projects that may be approved and implemented would also assess potential impacts related to land use and planning. The proposed Projects were found to have less than significant impacts related to compliance with County zoning, consistency with the County General Plan Land Use Plan intent and applicable land use conformance criteria, dividing an existing community, and with no significant impacts to the adjacent City of Lancaster. Additionally, the proposed Projects would not result in any significant or unavoidable land use impacts and represent a small fraction of the total amount of lands affected by renewable projects and foreseeable projects within a 5 mile radius of the Projects. Therefore, the proposed Projects would not be expected to significantly contribute to potential cumulative land use related impacts associated with other projects in the region. **(DEIR at 4.10-44)**.

3.11 NOISE

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 4), have the potential to result in cumulative Noise impacts.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 4, which mitigate or avoid significant Noise impacts. Project 4, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant Noise impact.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Two non-Applicant projects identified have the potential to result in cumulative construction noise impacts, due to the projects being located in relatively close proximity to the proposed Projects, but not close enough to result in vibration impacts. The Western Antelope Dry Ranch project (CUP 11-07) is located approximately 1-mile north of Project 2, and the High Desert LLC (CUP 10-03) project is located approximately 1-mile north of Project 4. These distances are close enough that construction noise could propagate out to distances near the Applicant's Projects, but are not close enough to potentially result in vibration impacts. The time period of construction for these two projects is unknown, but if construction were to overlap with construction of the proposed Projects, there is the potential for increased temporary noise levels at residences; however, none of the noise sensitive receptors that are located in close proximity to Project 4 are also located in close proximity to Antelope Solar 1 or Antelope Solar Farm projects. Therefore, sound levels from construction of the Projects would only be minimally increased (less than 1-2 dBA), or not at all, by simultaneous construction. Therefore, overall cumulative impacts of the proposed Projects 1 – 6 would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures N-1 to N-9. **(DEIR at 4.11-56)**.

3.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 4), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Public Services.

Finding:

Project 4, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Public Services. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Projects amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. It is assumed that for each of the cumulative projects, worksite traffic control plans, permits, and coordination with County departments regarding potential construction impacts would be implemented. **(DEIR at 4.12-16)**.

Projects 1 – 6 would not cause effects to result in significant demands to fire response times. Projects 1 – 6 would be designed with appropriate fire protection considerations, and would also result in less than significant impacts to staffing and response times. Furthermore, Projects 1 – 6 would be required to provide taxes to the County that are designed to address cumulative fire department needs associated with new and existing developments. Other developments in the vicinity of Projects 1 – 6 would also be required to pay taxes and fees to the County to provide

for their potential increase to LACFD fire protection service demands (LACFD 2009). Additionally, all development in the area is subject to review and approval by the Fire Department. This ensures that all projects contain appropriate controls to reduce demand on the fire department. As a result, Projects 1 – 6 would be anticipated to result in less than significant incremental contributions to cumulative fire protection impacts. **(DEIR at 4.12-17)**.

Projects 1 – 6 would not cause effects to result in significant demands to sheriff staffing or response times. Projects 1 – 6 would also implement site security control, including 24-hour remotely monitored video cameras for security monitoring to prevent potential theft and vandalism activities. Additionally, a portion of Projects 1 – 6 taxes levied would be allocated to sheriff services. Other developments in the vicinity of Projects 1 – 6 would also be required to pay taxes that would be allocated to sheriff services. As a result, construction and operation of Projects 1 – 6 would be anticipated to result in less than significant incremental contributions to cumulative sheriff protection impacts. Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with sheriff services would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-17)**.

Because development of Projects 1-6 will not induce population growth, no direct or cumulative impacts to schools, parks, libraries or other public facilities will occur. **(DEIR at 4.12-15; 4.12-16)**.

3.13 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 4), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Transportation and Traffic.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 4, which mitigate or avoid significant impacts to Transportation and Traffic. Project 4, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Transportation and Traffic.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Cumulative impacts for transportation and traffic are the combined effect of Projects 1 – 6 with the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects (other projects). This Cumulative Impacts discussion addresses the cumulative impacts of the Applicant's Projects 1 – 6 and the other projects within a geographic radius of 5-mile radius of the Projects (Project Study Area), which could potentially coincide with the expected construction schedule of the Applicant's Projects. Based on evaluation of the Project Study Area and available data from Los Angeles County, there are 29 other projects that have the potential to contribute additional traffic volume within the vicinity of Projects 1-6.

Evaluation of the cumulative impacts within the Project Study Area was focused on the construction-phase traffic for Projects 1-6 and other projects within a 5-mile radius. As previously stated in the individual conclusions for Project 4 above, the operational phase for each Project is anticipated to only generate a maximum of 4 vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hours on a quarterly or as-needed basis with a maximum of 12 additional trips, which would only occur when panel washing operations are being conducted. Based on the traffic analysis contained in the DEIR, the operational phase vehicle trips/traffic for the Projects are considered negligible and would not result in a significant cumulative impact on the traffic and/or transportation infrastructure in the Project Study Area. **(DEIR at 4.13-41 to 4.13-43)**.

3.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 4), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Utilities and Service Systems.

Finding:

Project 4, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Utilities and Service Systems. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, and regulations. Construction and operation of the cumulative projects would result in less than significant impacts to public facilities, which include electricity, gas, wastewater, and solid waste services. During construction, all cumulative projects would follow required measures to prevent construction interference to utility services, and would comply with recycling requirements to minimize solid waste disposal at solid waste facilities. During operation, the solar and wind generation projects would provide electricity, and would generate minimal amounts of solid waste. During operation, the non-solar/non-wind commercial and residential development projects would generate solid waste as would be expected from these residential and commercial uses; it is assumed that these project proponents have planned for and mitigated for the additional solid waste generation as appropriate.

The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would provide their own electricity for operational needs, no natural gas would be required for their operations, little wastewater (from panel washing) would be generated as part of the operations process, and very little solid waste would be generated. As a result, the total cumulative impacts to utility services would be less than significant, and the incremental contribution of Projects 1 – 6 to cumulative impacts related to utility services would

be less than significant. Furthermore, because the Applicant has committed to using out of Basin water during construction and operations, Projects 1 – 6 would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to water supply impacts in the Basin, and would have no significant cumulative effect on water supply. **(DEIR at 4.14-28)**.

SECTION 4.0 FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

These Findings and Statements of Fact regarding project alternatives and certain mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR are set forth to comply with Section 21002 of the Public Resources Code and Sections 15091(a)(3) and 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines. Five alternatives to the proposed Project (consisting of Projects 1-6) described in the Draft EIR were analyzed and considered as follows: 1) No Project Alternative; 2) Lower Intensity Projects; 3) Select Other Project Sites Alternative; 4) Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative; and 5) Wind Energy Generation Alternative. These alternatives constitute a reasonable range of alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. For the reasons set forth below, Alternatives 1-5 are rejected as infeasible for the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations set forth below.

4.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Description:

Under the No Project Alternative, Project sites 1-6 would remain in their present condition with site conditions (i.e., fallow agricultural land) as they currently exist.

Finding:

The No Project Alternative is rejected as infeasible because it fails to meet the Project goals and objectives, and would not contribute to the State's ability to meet its near- and long-term renewable energy generation goals and objectives.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would not be approved or implemented under the No Project Alternative. The potential environmental impacts and benefits of the proposed Projects would not occur as a direct consequence of implementation under the No Project Alternative. The No Project Alternative would involve taking no action to generate 172 MW of clean, renewable electrical power utilizing solar PV technology and to integrate the electrical output of the Projects into the electrical grid. This alternative would not allow one of the primary purposes of the proposed Projects which is to increase the output of renewable energy in support of the RPS, such that the State of California may meet its current and planned goals for increasing renewable generation at reasonable market rates.

The No Project Alternative assumes that the sites will remain as they currently exist (primarily fallow agricultural land) and no environmental impacts would result. In summary, the No Project Alternative is provided for comparative purposes to the proposed Projects 1 – 6. This alternative is incapable of meeting the stated goals and objectives of the Projects to provide 172 MW of

renewable electric energy to utility providers, and does not contribute to the state's ability to meet its near-term and long-term renewable energy generation goals and objectives. **(DEIR 5-1 to 5-2)**.

4.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: LOWER INTENSITY PROJECTS

Description:

Under the Lower Intensity Projects Alternative, fewer than six sites would be developed, and the smaller projects would be developed in a size and configuration that would result in generation of fewer than 172 MW of electricity.

Finding:

The Lower Intensity Projects Alternative is rejected as infeasible because it partially fails to accomplish the goals of the proposed Projects, which are to provide 172 MW of clean, renewable electric energy using solar PV technology, and to deliver the electric output on a wholesale basis to utility providers.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Projects 1-6 are designed to meet the increasing demand for clean, renewable electrical power. Any reduction in the size of the effort results in a similar potential reduction in the reliance on foreign sources of fuel, the diversification of energy portfolios, the contribution to the reduction of GHG emissions, and the generation of "green" jobs. It would also potentially reduce the contribution to the much needed on-peak power to the electrical grid in California.

The opportunity to develop solar power in Los Angeles County has a limited timeframe because the utility companies, which purchase the power, would purchase power from another entity if the proposed Projects are not completed in a timely manner. If Los Angeles County does not approve the six viable SGFs proposed here, the opportunity to contribute to the competitive solar generation business in the County will be further lost to other projects. The proposed Projects are well-positioned to compete in the industry, are comparatively environmentally superior to most other locations, and have good positions for PPAs and interconnection agreements. Additionally, any reduction of the megawatts produced from these Projects would further limit the County's contribution to the State's renewable energy production goals. These 5 to 52 MW Projects meet the utility industry needs for small projects, and any reduction of the respective Projects' size would jeopardize the success of the Projects. **(DEIR at 5-2)**.

4.3 ALTERNATIVE 3: SELECT OTHER PROJECT SITES ALTERNATIVE

Description:

Under the Select Other Project Sites Alternative, other properties could potentially be used for the six Project sites.

Finding:

The Select Other Project Sites Alternative is rejected, because this alternative would have the same or greater impacts to the environment as Projects 1-6, which can all be mitigated to below a level of significance.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

One key objective for the Project Applicant was to locate the Projects in an area with the following characteristics: (1) adequate solar radiation; (2) close proximity to interconnection locations for each solar site; (3) project sites with landowners who are willing to sell large enough parcels of land for solar generation at market price; (4) lack of threatened and/or endangered biological species on the site; (5) lack of nearby sensitive receptors or land uses to minimize potential conflicts with development (6) relatively flat sites that have previously been disturbed to minimize disturbance to native habitat and to minimize the need for site grading; (7) existing access to accommodate construction workforce needs; and (8) access to nearby workforce to minimize traffic and socioeconomic impacts. The Applicant performed in-depth analyses of over 10,000 acres of land in the Western Antelope Valley, as shown in DEIR Figure 6-1. Of the 10,000 acres screened, only ten percent met the criteria listed above.

The six Project sites selected and proposed by the Applicant are the most viable sites to develop solar electricity generation with minimal environmental impacts. These sites were also chosen for development based on interconnection capacity and requirements placed on the Applicant by the utility providers. Selection of other alternative sites would have the same or greater impacts to the environment since the present Projects are the result of a long and intense effort by the Applicant to find and acquire the most suitable sites according to the criteria given above. **(DEIR at 1-6; 5-3)**. Furthermore, the environmental impacts for Projects 1-6 can all be mitigated to below a level of significance.

4.4 ALTERNATIVE 4: ROOFTOP SOLAR GENERATION

Description:

Under the Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative, solar photovoltaic panels would be installed on private rooftops.

Finding:

The Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative is rejected as infeasible, because the Project Applicant does not have the ability to install solar panels on private rooftops.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

For rooftop solar to be a viable alternative to the proposed Projects it would need to provide 172 MW of electricity into the local grid. Assuming one residential installation can produce 25 kilowatts of electricity, a total of 6,880 residential installations would be needed to produce 172

MW of electricity. The Applicant does not have the ability to install solar panels on private rooftops; therefore this alternative is not feasible for the Applicant. **(DEIR at 5-3)**.

4.5 ALTERNATIVE 5: WIND ENERGY GENERATION

Description:

Under the Wind Energy Generation Alternative, electricity would be generated through the use of wind turbines.

Finding:

The Wind Energy Generation Alternative is rejected as infeasible, because the type of geographical location that is suitable for a wind farm is not available within the vicinity.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

For wind energy generation to be a reasonable alternative to the proposed Projects and meet the purpose and need of the proposed Projects, it would need to provide 172 MW of electricity into the local grid; and to be sited on previously disturbed land that utilizes existing electrical distribution facilities, ROWs, roads, and other existing infrastructure where feasible to minimize the need for new electrical support facilities. The area required for construction and operation of a 172 MW wind farm would require a much more specific type of geographical location than the Projects to provide adequate wind; a feasible project area of the nature required for wind electricity production is not readily available within the area of analysis for the proposed Projects. For this reason, this alternative is infeasible. **(DEIR at 5-3)**.

SECTION 5.0 FINDINDS REGARDING THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM ("MMRP")

Pursuant to Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code, the Commission, in adopting these Findings, also adopts the MMRP for the Silverado Power West Los Angeles Project. This Program is designed to ensure that, during Project implementation, the County and other responsible parties will comply with the mitigation measures adopted in these Findings.

The Commission hereby finds that the MMRP, which is incorporated herein by reference and attached as Exhibit A to these Findings, meets the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 by providing for the implementation and monitoring of Project conditions intended to mitigate potential environmental effects of the Project.

SECTION 6.0 CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15091 AND 15092 FINDINGS

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the administrative record, the Commission has made one or more of the following findings with respect to each of the significant effects of the Project:

A. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects on the environment.

B. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and such changes have been adopted by such other agency, or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the administrative record, and as conditioned by the foregoing:

A. All significant effects on the environment due to the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible.

SECTION 7.0 CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15084(D)(3) AND 15084(D)(4) FINDINGS

The County has relied on Sections 15084(d)(3) of the State CEQA guidelines, which allow acceptance of working drafts prepared by the Applicant, a consultant retained by the Applicant, or any other person. The County has also relied upon Section 15084(d)(4), which allows the Draft EIR to be prepared directly by, or under contract by the lead agency. The County has reviewed and edited as necessary the submitted drafts to reflect the County's own independent judgment, including reliance on County technical personnel from other departments.

SECTION 8.0 PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21082.1(C) FINDINGS

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(c), the Commission hereby finds that the lead agency has independently reviewed and analyzed the Final EIR, and that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency.

SECTION 9.0 NATURE OF FINDINGS

Any finding made by this Commission shall be deemed made, regardless of where it appears in this document. All of the language included in this document constitutes findings by this Commission, whether or not any particular sentence or clause includes a statement to that effect. This Commission intends that these Findings be considered as an integrated whole and, whether or not any part of these Findings fail to cross reference or incorporate by reference any other part of these findings, that any finding required or committed to be made by this Commission with respect to any particular subject matter of the Final EIR, shall be deemed to be made if it appears in any portion of these Findings.

SECTION 10.0 RELIANCE ON RECORD

Each and all of the findings and determinations contained herein are based on the competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire administrative record relating to the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project. The findings and determinations

constitute the independent findings and determinations of this Commission in all respects, and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.

SECTION 11.0 RELATIONSHIP OF FINDINGS TO EIR

The County finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the EIR or is in the record of proceedings in the matter.

SECTION 12.0 CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS

The custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the County's decision is based is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning located at 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012.

EXHIBIT A
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
("MMRP")

CEQA requires a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for projects where mitigation measures are a condition of project approval and development. The Draft EIR prepared for the Silverado Power West, Los Angeles County Projects identified mitigation measures, where appropriate, to avoid or substantially reduce the environmental impacts associated with the Project. This MMRP is designed to monitor the implementation of those mitigation measures. Accordingly, this MMRP has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15097.

This section lists each of the proposed Project Design Features (PDFs) and required Mitigation Measures (MMs) and identifies the corresponding action required for proof of compliance, the mitigation timing, the party responsible for implementation, and the monitoring agency or party responsible for ensuring each measure is adequately implemented.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Silverado Power West, Los Angeles County Projects
Project Nos. R2011-00833, 00798, 00799, 00807, 00801, 00805
March 2014

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.1 AESTHETICS				
A-1 A Fugitive Dust Control Plan to minimize dust (visual pollution) shall be prepared and implemented.	A. Submit Plan to AVAQMD for review and approval	Prior to any ground disturbance activities	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP AVAQMD
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD
A-2 The Project site shall be maintained free of debris, trash, and waste during construction.	Site inspection	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP
A-3 The Project site shall be visually screened or partially screened during construction by fencing.	A. Submit Site Plans for review and approval	Prior to issuance of applicable building permit	Applicant	LACDRP
	B. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP
A-4 A landscape plan shall be developed for each Project prior to Project construction that shows the detail of a 10-foot wide screening vegetation buffer intended to screen or partially screen the Project visually from area residents or travelers on nearby roadways.	A. Submit landscape plan for review and approval. The landscape plan must be approved prior to grading or building permit.	Prior to 1st grading or building permit whichever comes first for each project.	Applicant	LACDRP/LACFD – support/referral Approval of landscape plan
	B. Implement approved landscape plan	Prior to first energization approval by LADPW B & S	Applicant	LACDRP/LACFD – support/referral Approval of landscape plan
A-5 All lighting shall comply with applicable provisions of the Los Angeles County Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Lights shall be limited to types allowed by the ordinance, installed below maximum allowed heights, pointed downwards and shielded to minimize light trespass, and mounted on	Submit final lighting plan for review and approval	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
essential infrastructure rather than on separate light poles except where poles are required by regulation or by governing agency. Lighting will comply with the hours of operation requirements in the ordinance, and utilize automatic control devices to comply with time limits except where permitted by Los Angeles County. Lighting will be maintained in good repair at all times.				
5.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY				
No mitigation measures are required for Agriculture and Forestry.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.3 AIR QUALITY				
AQ-1 Water active sites at least twice daily (locations where soil disturbance is to occur would be thoroughly watered before earthmoving) during construction.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVQMD
AQ-2 All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of CVC Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-3 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-4 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not be idle more than five minutes in any one hour.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-5 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operation of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-6 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-7 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.	Submit Transportation Demand Management program for review and approval	Prior to issuance of building permits	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPW support and referral for trip reduction determination

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
AQ-8 During array area preparation, mowing shall be used instead of grading and/or disking, and shall be limited to no more than 3.5 acres per day per site to further reduce dust emissions during construction.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-9 All interior roads shall use long-lasting non-toxic chemical soil stabilizers designed for long-term dust stabilization on dirt roads.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-10 Interior array areas shall have re-established pre-existing vegetation or be established with drought tolerant, native, or native compatible vegetation, to the greatest extent feasible, approved by the County biologist and compliant with Fire Department requirements, within two years of energization authorization of an array area by the Department of Public Works, Building and Safety Division, to provide long-term dust stabilization under the arrays.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Biologist	LACFD LACDRP
AQ-11 Earth disturbing activities shall be suspended and/or additional water shall be applied to meet Rule 403 criteria if wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP AVAQMD
AQ-12 Construction activity shall utilize electricity from power poles on or adjacent to the Project sites rather than use of temporary diesel power generators and/or gasoline power generators when electricity with adequate circuit capacity is available from power poles in proximity to construction areas.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-13 In the event temporary night lighting is necessary for construction or maintenance purposes, lighting not requiring the use of diesel or gasoline driven generators shall be used.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
B-1 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a qualified biologist shall be retained by the Applicant as the lead biological monitor subject to the approval of the LACDRP and CDFW. That person shall ensure that impacts to all biological resources are minimized or avoided, and shall conduct (or supervise) pre-grading field surveys for species that may be avoided, affected, or eliminated as a result of grading or any other site preparation activities. The lead biological monitor shall ensure that all surveys are conducted by qualified personnel (e.g. avian biologists for bird surveys, herpetologists for reptile surveys, etc.) and that they possess	A. Retain qualified Biologist(s)	Prior to issuance of Grading Permit	Applicant/Construction Monitor	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Field Surveys	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Maintain daily monitoring reports	During Construction	Applicant/Construction Monitor	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
all necessary permits and memoranda of understanding with the appropriate agencies for the handling of potentially-occurring special-status species. The lead biological monitor shall also ensure that daily monitoring reports (e.g., survey results, protective actions, results of protective actions, adaptive measures, etc.) are prepared, and shall make these monitoring reports available to DRP and CDFW at their request.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-2 Pre-Construction surveys will be conducted prior to ground disturbance at each project site. These surveys will include all special-status species identified as having the potential to be present on the project site; including, but not limited to, badger, kit fox, southern grasshopper mouse, and the species listed below. • Pre-survey information gathering will include reviewing of all available agency nest data and mapping. • A focused pre-construction Swainson's hawk survey shall be conducted to locate any nesting sites within 5 miles of Projects 1 – 6. If Swainson's hawks or their active nests are located within 500 feet of the project sites, all construction-related work shall be postponed and CDFW will be consulted. • Project-related activities likely to have the potential of disturbing suitable bird nesting habitat, which includes ground nesting birds, shall be prohibited from February 1 through August 31, unless a qualified monitoring biologist conducts nesting bird surveys prior to any construction-related disturbance to confirm the absence of active bird nests or bird nesting habitat. Disturbance shall be defined as any activity that physically removes or damages vegetation or habitat or any action that may cause disruption of nesting behavior such as loud noise from equipment or artificial night lighting. Surveys shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. If an active bird nest is discovered, disturbance within 500 feet for raptors shall be postponed until the nest is vacated, offspring are independent of the nest area and there is no evidence of further attempts at nesting. Limits of avoidance shall be marked with high-visibility flagging or fencing. The Applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures and submit the records to LACDRP and CDFW to document compliance with applicable state and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds. • A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted on each site prior to grading. Pre-construction surveys for burrowing owl shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to	Pre-construction surveys for special-status species that have been identified as having potential to occur on site	Prior to grading or as specified per species	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
the commencement of disturbance. The surveys shall follow the protocols set forth by the California Burrowing Owl Consortium (1993 and 2012). If burrowing owls are found during the pre-construction survey, then replacement burrows and habitat must be provided prior to the commencement of construction. The Applicant shall be prepared to provide artificial replacement burrows in the event that owls are detected, either as wintering or breeding individuals. Wintering individuals may be evicted with the use of exclusion devices followed by a period of seven days to ensure that animals have left their burrows. When it can be assured that owls are no longer using the burrows, the burrows can be hand excavated and collapsed under the supervision of the avian biologist. Breeding owls must not be disturbed and must be allowed to complete the raising of young until the fledglings can forage independently of adults and it can be confirmed that further attempts at nesting shall not be undertaken. When this has been confirmed, the owls can be evicted as described above for wintering animals. • Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for special-status ground-dwelling reptiles, including but not limited to coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard. Surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground 4 to 6 weeks in advance of the survey effort, checking weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles or other species determined important by the qualified biological monitor (i.e., biologist must be appropriately permitted for collection and relocation activities) occurring within the work area prior to the start of work shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.				
B-3 During grading, earthmoving activities, and other construction activities the biological monitor shall be present to inspect and enforce all mitigation requirements and to relocate any species that may come into harm's way to an appropriate offsite location of similar habitat. The biological monitor shall be authorized to stop specific grading or	Biological Monitoring	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
construction activities if violations of mitigation measures or any local, state, or federal laws are suspected. The biological monitor shall file a report of the monitoring activities with LACDRP and CDFW. If ongoing biological monitoring of construction activities reveals the presence of any special-status reptiles within an active work area, then work shall be temporarily halted until the animals can be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones. Work areas shall be surveyed for special-status reptile species, such as the coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard, during construction activities. During the construction, surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground in appropriate work areas and checking them weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles occurring within the work area shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-4 Mitigation lands shall be acquired for Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, special-status migratory and wintering birds, and alkali mariposa lily. <u>Swainson's hawk</u>: Impacts due to development of the projects shall be mitigated by the acquisition of good quality Swainson's hawk habitat targeted within the Antelope Valley. Land shall be purchased or placed in a conservation easement or other suitable deed restriction and managed to maintain suitable habitat in perpetuity. The proposed development is not expected to result in the "take" of Swainson's hawk; however, the Applicant shall be required to consult CDFW in the event of take, which may result in additional mitigation prescribed by CDFW. Although the Projects are not expected to result in "take" of Swainson's hawk, mitigation will still be required to alleviate the effects of cumulative impacts on raptor, migratory bird, and burrowing owl habitats: Replacement land will be provided based on the quality of the mitigation land relative to the impacted habitat. The ratio of such replacement shall be determined as follows: • A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 3 acres of development if the replacement land is superior nesting and foraging habitat contiguous to occupied nesting and foraging habitat, and is within a designated or proposed Significant Ecological Area (SEA). • A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 2 acres of development if the replacement land is unoccupied irrigated land, contiguous to occupied habitat and providing superior quality foraging habitat with trees or other such nesting habitat; • A ratio of 1 acre of replacement land for each acre of development if the replacement land provides similar foraging and nesting habitat. <u>Burrowing Owl</u>: Mitigation for any occupied burrowing owl burrows found during pre-construction surveys will include a comprehensive tiered approach: • Pre-construction and construction monitoring surveys conducted by a qualified biologist to detect potential new owl activity onsite;	A. Acquire mitigation lands for Swainson's Hawk	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Acquire mitigation lands for Burrowing Owl	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Pre-construction survey for Alkali Mariposa Lilies	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	D. If necessary Acquire Alkali Mariposa Mitigation land	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
• Disturbance avoidance of occupied burrows during nesting period February 1 – August 31; • Impact avoidance of occupied burrows; • Burrow exclusion and closure and offsite relocation (>100 m), as described previously in in B-2, will be conducted for unavoidable impacts to occupied burrows (after consultation with CDFW). • Minimizing impacts by protecting in-place any owls, their burrows, and their immediate habitat by establishing setback zones and visual screens for burrows adjacent to construction activity; by placing visible markers, and by conducting construction worker awareness training. Setback widths will be applied as appropriate to the level of existing disturbance and owl stage of activity (e.g., for low to moderate construction-related disturbance activity outside the nesting season near burrows in currently high-traffic or disturbance areas, it is assumed owls are adapted to human disturbance and will not need a large setback). • Mitigating unavoidable impacts to habitat: restore temporary impacts to pre-existing conditions; replace nesting/occupied and satellite burrows lost with the same number of suitable burrows on the mitigation site. Mitigation acreage for foraging habitat provided for Swainson's hawk will be sufficient to replace lost burrowing owl habitat because the hawk's replacement habitat will be in-kind or better (i.e., the Project habitat is low quality overall and mitigation habitat will be at least the same quality as the lost habitat OR will have higher quality habitat features overall, such as increased vegetative structure, higher numbers of prey species, less disturbance, and less potential for predation by domestic animals, etc.). Specific habitat considerations as provided in the CDFW 2012 burrowing owl guidance will be considered in selecting the overall habitat replacement acres for the project. <u>Alkali Mariposa Lily</u>: Alkali mariposa lily will be avoided to the greatest extent possible. If pre-construction surveys reveal individuals that cannot be avoided, mitigation of lost alkali mariposa lily shall be provided at a minimum 1:1 ratio. This acreage will be calculated with input from LACDRP and CDFW. Additionally, because alkali mariposa Lilies have locally available seed sources, plantings of the lilies on				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
appropriate soil types on Projects shall be implemented in selected areas. The lilies may also be transplanted from areas planned for disturbance to more suitable locations in the Project area. Transplantation locations must be situated within adequately buffered areas to be found suitable. For all species the mitigation acreage may be located within the Project sites, but outside of the area of development, subject to LACDRP and CDFW approval, if acreage of sufficient quantity and quality exists.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-5 Review and Approval of Habitat Management Lands Prior to Acquisition: The Applicant shall provide a mitigation land acquisition proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for their approval before acquiring the property. The proposal shall discuss the suitability of the property by comparing it to the selection criteria. As a part of the preparation of the land acquisition proposal, acreage quantification by habitat category will be developed with LACDRP and CDFW based on the following criteria: <u>Habitat Management Land Selection Criteria</u>: The Applicant must identify the region within which lands shall be acquired, and the type and quality of habitat to be acquired. Detailed criteria and acreage for each habitat category will be developed with Los Angeles County and CDFW. Foraging habitat shall be assessed as moderate to good with a capacity to improve in quality and value to Swainson's hawks, and must be within the Antelope Valley Swainson's hawk breeding range. Foraging habitat with suitable nest trees is preferred. <u>Habitat Management Lands Acquisition</u>: Prior to initiating ground-disturbing activities, the Applicant shall provide a proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for off-site mitigation land to be restored, enhanced, or maintained according to the requirements of the biological mitigation measures in this EIR. The proposal will require that mitigation lands identified shall be preserved as open space in perpetuity. Within 45 days of acquiring the mitigation land(s), the Applicant shall record a permanent deed restriction on the mitigation land(s) to be preserved as open space. The deed restriction or conservation easement language shall be submitted to LACDRP and CDFW for review and approval prior to recordation. Alternatively, should a conservation easement on the mitigation land be offered, the permanent conservation easement shall be recorded to the satisfaction of LACDRP and CDFW. The Applicant shall establish a fund sufficient for the restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation land(s) until such time when the mitigation land(s) become self-sustaining and until such time as the mitigation land(s) meet the requirements of this mitigation measure. The fund shall be established within 90 days of mitigation land(s)	A. Obtain approval of habitat management lands	Prior to Acquisition	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Record a permanent deed restriction or conservation easement on mitigation land(s)	Within 45 days of acquiring land(s)	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Establish fund in the amount acceptable to LACDRP and CDFW for restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation lands	Within 90-days of mitigation land(s) acquisition	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
acquisition in an amount acceptable to the LACDRP and CDFW.				
Land Acquisition Schedule and Financial Assurances: The Applicant shall complete acquisition, or execute an irrevocable option to purchase, of proposed Habitat Management lands and shall provide financial assurances for dedicating adequate funding for impact avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, if necessary, prior to the issuance of building permits. If an irrevocable option to purchase is utilized, the applicant shall provide a proposed date of purchase which coincides with construction of the facility.				
B-6 Prior to alteration of any streambeds, the Applicant shall enter into an agreement with the CDFW, pursuant to Sections 1601 through 1603 of the State Fish and Game Code.	Enter into an agreement with CDFW pursuant to sections 1601 through 1603	Prior to alteration of Streambed	Applicant	CDFW
B-7 Within all interior portions of the site within and adjacent to the proposed solar arrays, re-vegetation shall be accomplished (excluding interior roads as follows: Vegetation seeded in these areas shall comprise locally-sourced, native species if available, or, native compatible as approved by the County biologist if sufficient locally-sourced native seed stock not available, approximating low-growing communities such as native perennial or annual grasslands (i.e., wildflower fields). Shrub species shall not be used due to these species inability to survive continued vegetation trimming. Vegetation shall be maintained in accordance with Los Angeles County Fire Department regulations.	Revegetation of interior site, excluding interior roads	After construction	Applicant	LACDRP
5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES				
CUL-1 In the event cultural resources are encountered during construction of the Projects, all ground-disturbing activities within the vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall be notified of the find. The archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American Monirot shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to recordation and excavation of the finds and evaluation and processing of the finds in accordance with § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Potentially significant cultural resources	A. Archaeological monitoring and Native American monitor when there is a find	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP NAHC
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Site inspection as needed	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
consist of, but are not limited to, stone, bone, fossils, wood or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resources are determined to be unique historic resources as defined under § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, Mitigation Measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate Mitigation Measures for significant resources could include but not be limited to avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. No further earthwork shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any archaeological artifacts recovered because of mitigation will be donated to a qualified scientific institution approved by the Lead Agency where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.			Archaeologist	
CUL-2 In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, California State Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 dictates that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to CEQA regulations and PRC § 5097.98. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.	A. Archaeological and Native American monitoring	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist/NAHC representative	LACDRP NAHC
	B. Maintain documentation demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-3 Project 4 construction of gen-tie lines shall maintain the right of way buffer zones prescribed by SCE for this historic electric transmission line resource, which is an active transmission line. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-4 Project construction for Project 4 shall maintain a one acre undisturbed area surrounding the Del Sur Cemetery	A. Submit pre-construction surveys	Prior to construction	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
site. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	B. Construction monitoring by qualified Archaeologist	During construction	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Submit construction monitoring documentation	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	D. Site inspection as needed	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-5 A County approved archaeologist will be retained to initiate and supervise cultural resource monitoring during Project related earthwork in areas of the Project that are within 50 feet from certain significant cultural resources, specifically from the defined perimeter of site CA-LAN-1579H (Project 4). If resources are identified, the procedures outlined in CUL-1 will be followed and/or CUL-2 (as necessary). This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	A. Archaeological monitoring	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
PALEO-1: A qualified paleontologist shall be retained by the Applicant prior to excavations reaching 10 feet in depth or greater. A The paleontologist shall develop and execute a Paleontological Resource Mitigation and Monitoring Program and supervise a paleontological monitor whom shall monitor all ground-disturbing activities associated with such excavations. The Program will outline the procedures to follow in regards to paleontological resources (e.g. monitoring protocols, curation, data recovery of fossils, reporting). If fossils are found during such excavation, the paleontological monitor shall be authorized to halt ground-disturbing activities within 25 feet of the find in order to allow evaluation of the find and determination of appropriate treatment according to the Program.	Paleontological Monitoring	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Paleontologist	LACDRP LAC Natural History Museum support/referral
5.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
No mitigation measures are required for Geology and Soils.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS				
GHG-1 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment	A. Submit operating permit(s) as required	Prior to commencement of construction	Applicant	AVAQMD LACDRP
	B. Maintain log	During construction	Applicant/Construction	AVAQMD

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.	demonstrating compliance		Manager	LACDRP
GHG-2 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not be idle more than five minutes in any one hour.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-3 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have proper training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operations of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-4 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 mph or less.	Site inspection as needed	During construction and grading	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-5 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	Prior to Building Permit	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.8 HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS WASTES				
HH-1 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Materials Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.	Submit Hazardous Materials Management Plan	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC
HH-2 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.	Submit Hazardous Waste Management Plan for each Project	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC
HH-3 Prior to the start of construction activities on the parcel containing the historic UST at the location of Project 1, a Phase I ESA will be completed. This mitigation measure only applies to Project 1.	Phase I ESA	Prior to issuance of grading permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP
HH-4 Prior to the start of construction activities, a closure permit for the UST will be verified or obtained from the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Health Hazardous Materials Division. This mitigation measure only applies to Project 1.	Closure permit or verification for UST – Project 1 site	Prior to issuance of grading permit(s)	Applicant	LACFD
HH-5 Construction activities shall be halted if previously unidentified soil contamination is observed or indicated by testing during any earthwork activities. Construction will be halted or redirected until such soil contamination is evaluated and disposed of and/or treated	Testing of soil contamination	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC LACDRP
5.9 HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY				
Construction				
HYDRO-1 Education and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants and Employees. Appropriate educational materials and training for preventing stormwater pollution and additional BMP Fact Sheets from the California Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks can be found at www.cabmphandbooks.com. Practical information material will be provided to employees on general good housekeeping practices. These materials will describe, but are not limited to, spill prevention and control and the use of chemicals, petroleum products, pesticides and fertilizers that should be limited to the property, with no discharge of wastes directly or indirectly to gutters, catch basins or the storm drain system. Information will be distributed directly to the employees as well as being posted in public areas. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities. The required materials shall be	Maintain log demonstrating compliance of Educational materials and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants, and Employee	During Construction	Applicant	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
available at each project site and a log kept to show education has occurred prior to the start of construction.				
HYDRO-2 A spill contingency plan will be prepared by the owner/building operator. As a minimum the Spill Contingency Plan will "mandate the stockpiling of cleanup materials, notification of responsible agencies, disposal of cleanup materials and documentation." This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Submit spill contingency plan	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACDRP
HYDRO-3 No hazardous materials are anticipated to be stored on-site. If deemed otherwise, a designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in accordance with requirements of the Health & Safety Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction and operations	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACFD
HYDRO-4 A designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in compliance of the current requirements of the County of Los Angeles Fire Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Submit all applicable information	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACFD
Operation				
HYDRO-5 Site waste receptacles shall be emptied on a weekly basis or more often if containers approach overflowing. Upon inspection any debris or rubbish will be picked up and the site cleaned. The trash area/room is NOT to be cleaned by hosing down. The type of materials used to clean the area and storage of said materials will be determined by the Contractor. Signage will be posted that lids shall be kept closed at all times. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 at all times during facility operations.	A. Include waste collection and disposal methods in construction contract specifications	During operation	Applicant	LACSD LACDRP
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During operation	Applicant	LACSD LACDRP
5.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING				
No mitigation measures are required for Land Use and Planning	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.11 NOISE				
N-1 Construction operations would not occur between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday, or at any time on Sunday with the exception of limited low-noise	Maintain log of construction equipment arrivals and exit times demonstrating	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
generating potential night work with Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning and Public Works approval.	compliance			
N-2 Construction site and access road maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour shall be established and enforced during the construction period.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-3 Electrically-powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, except for devices like trucks, loaders, dozers, and other heavy equipment.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-4 Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far as practicable, and no closer than 1,000 feet, from noise-sensitive receptors.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
	B. Inclusion of requirement for a Noise Control Plan	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
N-5 The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells are prohibited except where required by OSHA or for safety or emergency warning purposes required by other regulatory agencies.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-6 Project-related public address or music systems used on-site shall not be audible at any adjacent receptor.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
N-7 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 which are in compliance with any applicable legally required equipment noise standards. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors) shall be equipped with shrouds and/or other noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment. Mobile sound barriers with a sound transmission class of 19 or greater will be used for pile driving on Projects where received sound levels at the nearest NSR are predicted to be above the County construction noise limit of 60 dBA during the day.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
	B. Site inspection as needed	During Construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including: **N-8** Siting substations to achieve NEMA sound ratings at sensitive receptors as described in Section 4.11.5.2 not to be closer to the property line of sensitive receptors than the following distances for each individual project: • Project 1 – 325 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 74 dBA • Project 2 – 1,511 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 81 dBA • Project 3 – 650 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 74 dBA • Project 4 (two transformers) – 1,000 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 77 dBA • Project 5 – 748 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 82 dBA	A. Submit acoustical report demonstrating substation design compliance with applicable noise standards	Prior to issuance of relevant building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer
	B. Construct structures in compliance with noise limit requirements of applicable County codes.	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH
	C. Submit post-construction noise measurements verifying compliance upon request	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support/referral
With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including: **N-9** The Applicant shall choose to use NEMA low noise rated transformer equipment which will achieve 10 dBA or greater noise reduction as compared to standard NEMA-rated transformers of a similar size and rated capacity to ensure that Project noise impacts would be less than significant.	A. Submit acoustical report demonstrating substation design compliance with applicable noise standards	Prior to issuance of relevant building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer
	B. Construct structures in compliance with noise limit requirements of applicable County codes.	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH
	C. Submit post-construction noise measurements verifying compliance upon request	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support/referral
5.12 PUBLIC SERVICES				
No mitigation measures are required for Public Services	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.13 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC				
TT-1 Prior to issuance of first grading or building permit, Applicant shall document and submit all required information	Submit Projects' road survey	Prior to issuance of first grading or building	Applicant	LACDPW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
and/or material pertaining to the pavement conditions of construction routes for the Projects, including the formula for calculation of the Projects' fair share of any repair or reconstruction of construction routes to the satisfaction of LACDPW. Applicant shall reimburse the County of Los Angeles for the cost of any repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes attributable to the Projects as agreed to by LACDPW. The timing of any necessary repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes and the required payment by the Applicant shall be determined by LACDPW.		permit		
TT-2 The County, including LACFD Fire Stations 78 (for R2011-00801) and 130 (for R2011-00798, 00799, 00805,00807, & 00833) shall be notified at least three days in advance of any street closures that may affect fire and/or paramedic responses in the area. The Applicant shall provide alternate route (detour) plans to the County, including three sets to LACFD, with a tentative schedule of planned closures, prior to the beginning of construction.	Provide street closure notifications	Three days prior to any street closures impacting fire and/or paramedics	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACFD
TT-3 Stagger construction work shifts before or after peak traffic hours.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support referral Caltrans
	B. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support referral Caltrans
TT-4 Schedule truck deliveries during off peak hours.	Maintain log of truck arrivals and exit times demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
TT-5 Limit water truck deliveries during the AM peak hour to 30 percent of the daily water truck trips.	Maintain log of truck arrivals and exit times demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
TT-6 Encourage carpooling between construction works.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
5.14 UTILITIES				
No mitigation measures are required for Utilities.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
List of Acronyms: B & S – building and safety BMP – Best Management Practice CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act CASQA – California Association of Stormwater Quality Agencies CBC – California Building Code CDFW – California Department of Fish and Wildlife CUP – Conditional Use Permit CVC – California Vehicle Code dBA – decibels (acoustics) DPR – Department of Parks and Recreation ESA – Environmental Site Assessment hp – Horsepower LACDPW – Los Angeles County Department of Public Works LACFD – Los Angeles County Fire Department mph – miles per hour NEMA – National Electrical Manufacturers Association OSHA – Occupational Safety and Health Administration PRC – Public Resources Code ROW – Right of Way SCE – Southern California Edison SWPPP – Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan UFC – Uniform Fire Code UST – Underground Storage Tank WATCH – Work Area Traffic Control Handbook LACDPH – Los Angeles County Department of Public Health LACSD – Los Angeles County Sanitation District				

FINDINGS OF FACT REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

FOR THE SILVERADO POWER WEST LOS ANGELES COUNTY PROJECT

PROJECT SITE NO. 5 (Silver Sun Greenworks)

COUNTY PROJECT NO. R2011-00801-(5)

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 201100072

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 201100109

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2012061068

PROJECT FINDINGS ORGANIZATION

Section 1	Introduction
Section 2	Findings Regarding Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Have Been Mitigated to a Less than Significant Level
Section 3	Findings Regarding Cumulative Environmental Effects Which are Not Significant or Which Have Been Mitigated to a Less Than Significant Level
Section 4	Findings Regarding Project Alternatives
Section 5	Findings Regarding the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Section 6	CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 and 15092 Findings
Section 7	CEQA Guidelines Section 15084(D)(3) and 15084(D)(4) Findings
Section 8	Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(C) Findings
Section 9	Nature of Findings
Section 10	Reliance on Record
Section 11	Relationship of Findings to EIR
Section 12	Custodian of Records
Exhibit A	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP")

SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The County of Los Angeles ("County") Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") hereby certifies and finds that the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County ("Project") Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR"), State Clearinghouse Number 2012061068, has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq., "CEQA") and the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Cal. Code Regs. Sections 15000 et seq., "CEQA Guidelines").

The Project Final EIR consists of the following documents: (1) December 2013 Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR" or "DEIR"); (2) December 2013 Technical Appendices to the Draft EIR; and (3) March 2014 Final EIR.

The Commission hereby further certifies that it received, reviewed and considered the information contained in the following: (i) the Final EIR; (ii) the application for Conditional Use Permit No. 201100072; and (iii) all hearings, and submissions of testimony from County officials and departments, the Applicant (as defined herein), the public, other public agencies, community groups, and organizations.

Concurrently with the adoption of these findings, the Commission adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP"), attached hereto as Exhibit A. Having received, reviewed and considered the foregoing information, as well as any and all information in the administrative record and the record of proceedings, the Commission hereby makes the following Findings of Fact ("Findings") pursuant to and in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15090:

SECTION 1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

1.1.1 Project Location.

The Project site is located in the northern portion of unincorporated Los Angeles County. The EIR analyzed a total of six (6) individual Project sites (collectively, "Projects" or "Projects 1-6"), which will each be subject to separate review and approval by the County.[1]

These Findings specifically pertain to "Project 5", which is approximately 160 acres and located at 120th Street West and West Avenue I, in Lancaster, California. The Assessor's Parcel Numbers ("APNs") for Project 5 are 3267-003-001, 3267-003-002, and 3267-003-003. When complete, Project 5 would produce 20 megawatts ("MW") of electricity from solar photovoltaic modules.

[1] The six individual Projects are not dependent upon each other for success. Each Project can succeed as a stand-alone project if other projects are not approved by Los Angeles County or if technical or financial problems delay or block the completion of a Project. CEQA allows for a group of projects to be analyzed as a single EIR; each Project must also receive approval of its CUP application and other entitlements on the merits of the individual Project and individual site.

1.1.2 Project Description—Features Common to Projects 1 - 6.

There are certain general Project characteristics and features that will apply to each of the individual six Project sites, including Project 5, as follows:

All six of the Projects would be designed and built using the same or similar methods and would have similar Project characteristics. The Projects would utilize photovoltaic ("PV") technology on fixed-tilt or tracker mounting supports. The proposed PV Projects would be constructed in phases and operated for an estimated 35 years. Construction would generally take place during normal daylight hours and would conform to County construction requirements.

Each Project would consist of the following elements:

- PV modules;
- PV module mounting system;
- Balance of system and electrical boxes (e.g., combiner boxes, electrical disconnects);
- Substation (Projects 1 – 5);
- Electrical inverters and transformers;
- Electrical AC collection system, including switchgear;
- Data monitoring equipment;
- Generation tie line; and
- Access roads and chain link perimeter security fencing.

<u>Solar PV Generating Facilities</u>

The Solar Generating Facilities ("SGFs") are designed for optimum performance and ease of maintenance. The Projects would consist of a series of PV module arrays mounted on racking systems, which are typically supported by a pile-driven foundation design. The foundation design would be determined based on the full geotechnical survey. The module mounting system, or racking system, would have a fixed-tilt or tracker PV array configuration and would be oriented south to maximize the amount of incident solar radiation absorbed over the course of the year. Electricity from a series of PV arrays would be funneled and combined at combiner boxes located throughout the SGF. The electrical current would then be further collected and combined prior to feeding the inverters. The SGF would be laid out in a PV block design to allow adequate area for maintenance in the way of clearances or access roads.

Inverters would be consolidated in areas to minimize cable routing and trenching and ensure minimal electrical losses. The alternating current ("AC") from the inverters would be routed through an AC collection system and consolidated within system switchgear. The final output from the SGF would be processed through a transformer to match the interconnection voltage. Electrical safety and protection systems would be provided to meet utility, International Organization for Standardization, and regulatory codes and standards. The energy would be

delivered to the regional electrical distribution network. A security perimeter fence with appropriate signage for public protection would be installed. Points of ingress/egress would be accessed by locked gates for facility services and maintenance.

Photovoltaic Modules

The SGFs would require installation of PV modules. The total number of PV modules required would depend on the technology selected, optimization evaluation, and detailed design. The market conditions, economic considerations, and the environmental factors would be taken into account during the detail design process. The following PV module technologies or equivalent are being considered for incorporation into the Projects:

- PV thin-film technology
- PV crystalline silicon technology
- Fixed-tilt configuration; and
- Tracking design configuration.

The modules configured with a fixed tilt would be oriented toward the south and angled at a degree that would optimize solar resource efficiency. For the tracking configuration, the modules would rotate from east to west over the course of the day. Modules would be non-reflective and highly absorptive.

Standard Installation, Array Assembly, and Racking

The final racking system would be determined by optimization evaluations and economic assessments and incorporated into the detailed design. Likewise, the final foundation design would be determined based on the geotechnical survey for each of the PV Project locations. Once the foundation has been installed, the module mounting system would be installed on it. For a tracking configuration, motors would be installed to drive the tracking mechanism. The PV modules would be delivered to each site during construction to support the installation schedule. The module mounting system would be oriented in rows within a PV design block, presenting a standard and uniform appearance across the facility. The panel configuration would be uniform in height and width.

Collection, Inverters, AC Collection, and Transformers

Modules would be electrically connected into strings. Each string would be funneled by electrical conduit (typically underground) wiring to combiner boxes located throughout the solar field power blocks. The output power cables from the combiner boxes would be again consolidated and feed the direct current ("DC") electricity to inverters, which convert the DC to AC. Underground electrical cables would be installed using ordinary trenching techniques, which include excavation of trenches to accommodate conduits. Wire depth and trench backfill would be in accordance with local, state, and federal codes.

The AC energy would be stepped up to the appropriate interconnection voltage by system transformers to match the voltage at the grid interconnection. As required, switchgear cabinetry

would be provided where necessary for circuit control. All electrical inverters, transformers, and gear would be placed on concrete foundation structures.

Commissioning of equipment would include testing, calibration of equipment, and troubleshooting. All electrical equipment, inverters, collector system, and PV array systems would be tested prior to commencement of commercial operations.

Substations

For Projects 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, which require substations, the area for the substations would be appropriately graded and excavated to accommodate transformer equipment, the control building foundation, and oil containment area. Foundations for equipment within each approximately 1-acre substation would be constructed with reinforced concrete.

Structural components in the Project substation area would include:

- Transformers, switchgear, and safety systems; and
- Footings and oil containment system for transformers.

Interconnection Descriptions

Each inverter would be fully enclosed and pad mounted and would be approximately 90 inches in height. The AC output of two inverters would be fed via underground cable into the low-voltage side of the inverter step-up transformer, generally within 20 feet of the inverters. Each transformer would be mounted on a concrete pad and enclosed together with switchgear and a junction box. Transformers are typically 87 inches in height. The high-voltage output of the transformer would be combined in series via underground collector cables to the junction box of the nearest transformer, ranging from as little as 60 feet to as much as 700 feet. The collector system cables would be tied throughout the SGF at underground junction boxes to the main underground collector cables, which would be composed of a larger wire gauge, to the location of the generator step-up transformer ("GSU"), as applicable at each Project location. The main collector cables would rise into the low-voltage busbar and protection equipment that would be enclosed together with the GSU. The primary switchgear includes the main circuit breaker and utility metering equipment, and it would be enclosed separately but pad-mounted together with the GSU. Both the GSU and the primary switchgear would stand approximately 87 inches in height.

The output of the switchgear would be the start of the Project generation tie ("gen-tie") line. The connections from the SGFs to the regional transmission lines are made through the construction of gen-tie lines. Los Angeles County requires that all gen-tie lines be underground except when other applicable regulations require otherwise, and Projects 1 − 6 are each designed in this manner. Each gen-tie line would consist of three phases of either underground or overhead conductor and a disconnect switch. The overhead conductor would be mounted on either wooden or tubular steel poles of varying heights ranging from 55 to 85 feet. Pole height would be determined by the span between poles as defined in the final design for each Project.

Data Collection Systems

Each Project would be designed with a comprehensive Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition ("SCADA") system for remote monitoring of facility operation and/or remote control of critical components. Within the site, the fiber optic or other cabling required for the monitoring system, would be installed with the gathering line system throughout the solar field leading to a centrally located (or series of appropriately located) SCADA system cabinets. The external telecommunications connections to the SCADA system cabinets may be through either wireless or hard-wired telecommunications to a centralized data collection center.

The system would also include a permanent meteorological data collection system. The station would have several weather sensors: a pyranometer for measuring solar irradiance, a thermometer to measure air temperature, a barometric pressure sensor, and two wind sensors to measure speed and direction. These sensors would be connected to a data logger, which would compile the data for transmission to the data collection center.

Construction

Construction for each of the six Project facilities consists of three major phases: (1) site preparation, (2) PV system installation testing and startup, and (3) site cleanup/restoration. Best Management Practices ("BMPs") would be required during all construction phases of the Projects. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP") incorporating BMPs for erosion control would be prepared and approved before the start of construction. The Projects would also comply with applicable post-construction water quality standards adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board ("RWQCB").

PV System Installation

PV system installation includes earthwork, grading, and erosion control, as well as construction of the plant substation and erection of the PV modules, supports, and associated electrical equipment. System installation would begin with teams installing the steel/concrete piers support structures. The exact design would be finalized pending evaluation of soil conditions.

The proposed method of installation would be the use of vibration-driven pile foundations. This step would be followed by panel installation and electrical work. A very limited volume of concrete would be required for the substation footings, foundations, pads for the transformers, and other substation equipment. Silverado Power, LLC ("Applicant") does not propose to use excavated and poured footings or foundations for the PV arrays. Concrete would be produced at an off-site location by a local provider and transported to the Project sites by truck.

The enclosures housing the inverters have a pre-cast concrete base. Final concrete specifications would be determined during detailed design engineering consistent with applicable building codes. The primary site preparation method for the PV modules would be mowing, because the majority of the six sites are very flat with little change in topography. However, there may be a few instances where limited earthwork, including ponding area leveling of less than one foot in depth, and erosion control cultivation may be required to accommodate the placement of PV arrays. Other than required grading for roads, pads, and drainage features, and standard

trenching and installation work, no other earthwork would be performed within the array areas. Erosion control techniques used during construction may include the use of silt fencing, straw bales, temporary catch basins, inlet filters, and truck tire muck shakers. Construction of the PV arrays includes the installation of support beams, module rail assemblies, PV modules, inverters, transformers, and buried electrical cables.

Wastes generated during construction may include the following: cardboard, wood pallets, copper wire, scrap steel, common trash, and wood wire spools. The Applicant does not expect to generate hazardous waste during construction. However, field equipment used during construction would contain various hazardous materials such as hydraulic oil, diesel fuel, grease, lubricants, solvents, adhesives, paints, and other petroleum-based products contained in construction vehicles.

Operations & Maintenance

Upon commissioning, the Projects would enter the operational phase. For the duration of the operational phase, the Projects would be operated and monitored remotely by a third party contractor, with an assumed two on-site visits for security, maintenance, and system monitoring per quarter (total of eight trips per year) by two third party employees in one light duty truck, and two on-site visits by four third party employees for biannual panel washing that includes one light duty truck and one water truck. Therefore the trips would be no more than 10 trips annually for security, maintenance, system monitoring and panel washing. There would be no personnel stationed on-site full time during operations. The PV arrays would produce electricity passively with minimal moving parts; therefore, maintenance requirements would be limited. Any required planned maintenance would be scheduled to avoid peak-load periods, and unplanned maintenance would typically be responded to as needed depending on the event.

Security

To ensure the safety of the public and the facilities, the sites would be fenced and signs would be posted. Security measures would be installed as necessary to mitigate and/or deter unauthorized access. Access to the sites would be controlled and gates would be installed at the roads entering the property.

Decommissioning Plan

A Decommissioning Plan for each of the Projects would be prepared and submitted for approval to Los Angeles County prior to obtaining a grading permit. The plan would assure that the land is protected during operations and returned as closely as possible to its original state upon termination of the use of the land as a SGF. It is unknown at this time if solar energy electricity production would continue to be utilized on this land in excess of 35 years, and thus the future long-term use of the site beyond 35 years is unknown. The life of each facility is presently proposed to be 35 years. The Decommissioning Plan would be implemented in the early summer of the year or year following the time of facility closure thus allowing the site reclamation to be completed outside of the rainy season and before winter begins. In the event that a Project ceases

operations prior to completion of the 35-year estimated life of the Project, applicable provisions of the Decommissioning Plan would commence.

Section 1.1.3 Project Description—Features Unique to Project Site 5

Project 5 (Silver Sun Greenworks) would have a generating capacity of 20 MW-AC and would be located on 160 acres of primarily unproductive agricultural land in unincorporated northern Los Angeles County. Project 5 would operate year-round, producing electric power during daytime hours.

The power generated by the Project 5 SGF would be connected to SCE's existing transmission network with the voltage transformation equipment and system safety equipment constructed on the site. Electricity would be delivered to the existing SCE Antelope Substation, near the intersection of 95th Street West and West Avenue J, via a 2.4-mile gen-tie originating at the DC collection system within the SGF. From the southeast corner of the Project 5 site, the gen-tie path is as follows: 0.56 miles underground in Los Angeles County across private land to the east, 0.02 miles underground across 110th Street West, 0.44 miles either overhead or underground to the south along the east side of 110th Street West, either within the County public ROW or on private land, and 1.38 miles to the east either underground or overhead along the south side of West Avenue J, either within the Lancaster public ROW or on private land. Alternatively, the gen-tie may be placed 0.44 miles underground along the west side of 110th Street West in the County, and 0.02 miles underground across 110th Street West. An easement would be obtained for this route.

An alternative interconnection plan would be a 1.5-mile gen-tie line to a proposed Antelope-Plainview collector substation at West Avenue J and 105th Street West. The gen-tie line path would be as follows: 0.56 miles underground in the County across private land to the east, 0.02 miles underground across 110th Street West, 0.44 miles to the south either overhead or underground along the east side of 110th Street West, either within the County public ROW or on private land, and 0.5 miles either underground or overhead along the south side of West Avenue J to the east, either within the Lancaster public ROW or on private land. Alternatively, the gen-tie line may be placed 0.44 miles underground to the south along the west side of 110th Street West, either within the County public ROW or on private land, 0.02 miles underground across 110th Street West, and 0.5 miles either underground or overhead along the south side of West Avenue J to the east, either within the Lancaster public ROW or on private land. An easement would be needed for this route. The proposed, previously approved private Antelope-Plainview collector substation would serve as a point to aggregate the generation output of multiple proposed projects in the area onto one set of conductors. Steel structures would be physically located at the collector substation to land the individual project 66 kV gen-tie lines and combine them onto one higher capacity set of conductors. The collector substation would include the electrical system protection equipment (circuit breaker, disconnect switches, instrumentation transformers, protective relays) necessary to identify and isolate electrical faults and safely disconnect the generators from the SCE transmission system. The collector substation would also house revenue metering equipment, and monitoring and telecommunications equipment housed in a small control building. The monitoring equipment aggregates key system data (MW produced, MVAR produced, status of protective devices, voltage level) from the PV system for delivery to the SCE system via the diverse telecommunication circuits.

A separate, previously approved gen-tie line would connect the Antelope-Plainview collector substation to the SCE Antelope Substation. Electricity from multiple projects would be delivered to the existing SCE Antelope Substation via this 0.9 mile gen-tie line originating at the collector substation. The gen-tie line would be located along the south side of West Avenue J, either within the Lancaster public ROW or on private land. The gen-tie line would be overhead or underground from the Antelope-Plainview collector substation to an area near the high voltage transmission lines approximately 700 feet east of 100th St. West in Lancaster. From this location, the gen-tie line would be located underground where it would ultimately interconnect into the SCE Antelope Substation. The overhead portion of the gen-tie line would consist of multiple conductors mounted on either tubular steel or wooden poles, which would be approximately 55 to 85 feet in height. The proposed Antelope-Plainview collector substation and 0.9 mile gen-tie to the existing Antelope substation have undergone CEQA review by the City of Lancaster, and are not further analyzed in this EIR.

The gen-tie line route for Project 5 would traverse land use designation N-1 in the County of Los Angeles per a Franchise Agreement. Within the City of Lancaster, the gen-tie line route would traverse land use designations NU and UR. In July 2013, the City of Lancaster approved a General Plan Amendment for the UR designation to NU designation for another Applicant's solar project that the gen-tie line would traverse to connect to the Antelope Substation. An agreement will be obtained by the Applicant with the City of Lancaster for the gen-tie line that will traverse through this jurisdiction. This agreement will grant ROW privileges for the proposed gen-tie line for Project 5.

Project 5 Telecommunications Lines

The primary telecommunication method for Project 5 is expected to be direct fiber optic cables placed overhead or underground along the path of the gen-tie line within the public ROW or located on private land, extending from the Project 5 site to the SCE Antelope Substation. A dedicated broadband connection from a local provider will be secured at the site.

Project 5 Construction

The proposed Project 5 construction schedule is to begin site preparation and construction in the third quarter of 2014, complete construction within approximately five months, and be commercially operational by the fourth quarter of 2014. Construction of the site, beginning with site preparation and grading through equipment setup and commencement of commercial operation, is expected to last approximately eight months. The on-site workforce would consist of laborers, electricians, supervisory personnel, support personnel, and construction management personnel. Construction would generally occur during daylight hours, Monday through Friday. Construction activities would be conducted consistent with Los Angeles County regulations regarding hours of construction. Project 5 is expected to create 100 new jobs at peak crew size during the construction phase.

The maximum estimated water use for Project 5 is expected to be 97 acre feet, which would be trucked to this site from a private provider of out-of-Basin or other authorized water. Construction water needs would be limited to soil conditioning and dust suppression. Potable water would be brought to the Project 5 site for drinking and domestic needs.

Project 5 Operations

No personnel would be stationed at the facility, and no occupied structures would be built on the site. Full and part-time positions over the life of the Project would be required for periodic operation and maintenance activities, and would be performed by a third-party contractor. Operational water requirements for Project 5 would be 2.9 acre feet per year ("AFY").

Section 1.1.4 Discretionary Actions Required for Project 5

Implementation of Project 5 will require the following discretionary approval action by the County:

- **Conditional Use Permit ("CUP")**: To authorize the construction and operation of a solar photovoltaic electricity generating plant on 160 acres and installation of a water tank in the A-2-5 Zone. The project meets the definition of "electric generating plant" in the Los Angeles County Zoning Code. Pursuant to Section 22.24.150, electric generating plants are a use subject to a conditional use permit in the A-2 Zone.

Section 1.1.5 Statement of Project Objectives

Together, proposed Projects 1 – 6 would meet the existing and future demand for electricity generated from clean, renewable technology by generating 172 MW of electrical energy from the sun. Recent legislation enacted in California recognizes the multiple benefits associated with the development of renewable energy resources. These benefits include a reduced reliance on fossil fuel, diversification of energy portfolios, reductions in greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions, and the creation of "green" jobs within the state of California. Additionally, the Projects would assist California in meeting the newly established Renewable Energy Portfolio Standards ("RPS"). Senate Bill 14 established RPS targets for California, stating: "All retail sellers of electricity shall serve 33 percent of their load with renewable energy by 2020." State government agencies have been directed to take all appropriate actions to implement this target in all regulatory proceedings, including siting, permitting, and procurement for renewable energy power plants and transmission lines.

Each of the six proposed PV Project sites, including Project 5, qualify as eligible renewable energy resources as defined by the California Public Resources Code, and would help the State meet the objective of increasing renewable energy generation. In addition, Projects 1-6 would contribute much-needed competitive energy during peak power periods to the electrical grid in California.

As another key objective, Projects 1-6 have each been sited to minimize impacts to the environment and the local community as follows:

- Using disturbed land or land that has been previously degraded from prior use;
- Using existing electrical distribution facilities, rights-of-way, roads, and other existing infrastructure where feasible to minimize the need for new electrical support facilities; and

- Minimizing impacts to threatened or endangered species or their habitats, wetlands and waters of the United States, cultural resources, and sensitive land uses.

SECTION 1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT PROCESS

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, the County completed an Initial Study (June 13, 2012) for the proposed Project, and determined that an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") was required. A Notice of Preparation ("NOP"), including the Initial Study was circulated to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, responsible, trustee, and interested agencies, and key interest groups beginning June 20, 2012 to solicit comments on the proposed content of the Draft EIR. The NOP was circulated for the required 30-day comment period which ended July 20, 2012. A Scoping Meeting was held on July 14, 2012 at the Lancaster Library located at 601 West Lancaster Boulevard in Lancaster, California, to facilitate public review and comment on the Project.

The Draft EIR includes the Initial Study, the comment letters received during the public review period in response to the NOP, and a transcript of verbal comments received during the Scoping Meeting (see Draft EIR Appendix A-1 to A-5). All NOP comments relating to the EIR were reviewed and the issues raised in those comments were addressed, to the extent feasible, in the Draft EIR.

Potentially significant environmental impacts addressed in the Draft EIR include Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Public Services, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. The Draft EIR analyzed both Project-level and cumulative effects of the Project on these topics and identified a variety of mitigation measures to minimize, reduce, avoid, or compensate for the potential adverse effects of the proposed Project.

The Draft EIR also analyzed five potential alternatives to the proposed Project, including: 1) No Project Alternative; 2) Lower Intensity Projects; 3) Select Other Project Sites; 4) Rooftop Solar Generation; and 5) Wind Energy Generation. Potential environmental impacts of each of these alternatives were discussed at the CEQA-prescribed level of detail and comparisons were made to the proposed Project.

The Initial Study determined that the Project would result in less than significant or no impact to several environmental resource areas:

1) **Mineral Resources**: The Project would not have the potential to result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region, including those identified in a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

2) **Employment, Population & Housing**: The Project would provide significant short-term employment for construction workers during the two year construction period. The

duration of construction for the Projects would be less than two years; and construction personnel would commute to the Projects from Lancaster, the Los Angeles areas, and Kern County. However, jobs would be temporary and would be for the two year construction period. Construction workers would not establish new households and are not anticipated to permanently relocate to the area. Additionally, adequate construction personnel presently living in Los Angeles and Kern County would fill all of the jobs that will be available. Area population, housing demands and the need for educational facilities and libraries would not be affected significantly because jobs that would be created are short term in nature; therefore, they would not be impacted by the Projects. Employment, Population, and Housing would not be impacted because the Projects do not require a significant number of personnel to operate them once they are built and producing electricity, and they do not have growth inducing impacts to the local community. Requirements for operations and maintenance are not significant and would be conducted by a few specialized contracted third-party personnel who will cover the Projects. There is no operations and maintenance building on any of the Projects 1-6.

3) **Recreation**: The Project would have no impact on recreation opportunities in the area. There are adequate recreation opportunities in the area, and the availability of these would not change as a result of the Project.

Following the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("LACDRP") internal departmental review and analysis of the proposed Project through the screencheck process, the Draft EIR was submitted to the State Clearinghouse, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, and circulated for public review period beginning January 6, 2014. The 45-day public review period required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15087 ended on February 19, 2014.
A public hearing was held before the County's Hearing Examiner to take public testimony on the Draft EIR, at Lancaster Library located at 601 West Lancaster Boulevard in Lancaster, California, held at 1:00 p.m. on February 1, 2014. Approximately 80 people attended the Hearing Examiner meeting, and 26 attendees provided oral comments on the Draft EIR. A transcript of the oral comments made at the Hearing Examiner Meeting is contained in Section 2.0 of the Final EIR.

SECTION 1.3 PROJECT FINDINGS INTRODUCTION

The Findings made by the County, pursuant to Section 21081 of CEQA, and Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, on the consideration of Project 5 of the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project in unincorporated Los Angeles County, California are presented below. All potentially significant impacts of the Project identified in the Final EIR are included herein, and are organized according to the resources affected.

The Findings in this document are for Project 5 of the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project, and are supported by information and analysis from the Final EIR and other evidence in the administrative record.

For each significant impact, a Finding has been made as to one or more of the following, in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091:

A. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects on the environment.

B. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.

A narrative of supporting facts follows the appropriate Finding. For all of the impacts, one or more of the findings above have been made. The proposed Project will not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts.

SECTION 2.0 FINDINGS REGARDING POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH ARE NOT SIGNIFICANT OR WHICH HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

All Final EIR mitigation measures, as set forth in the MMRP (attached as Exhibit A to these findings) have been incorporated by reference into the conditions of approval for Project 5. These mitigation measures and conditions of approval will result in a substantial mitigation of the effects of Project 5, such that the effects are not significant or have been mitigated to a level of less than significant. Specifically, the Commission has determined, based on the Final EIR, that Project 5 design features, mitigation measures, and conditions of approval will reduce Project impacts concerning Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Public Services, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems to a level of less than significant.

2.1 AESTHETICS

Potential Effect:

Project 5 would have significant visual impacts to the Project area if it had a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; would be visible from, or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail; substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features; or create a new source of substantial light or glare which will adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 5 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Aesthetics.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 5 would be not located along or in proximity to a state scenic highway. The Project 5 SGFs would not substantially damage or impact scenic resources such as trees (including Joshua trees) or rock outcroppings, and there are no historic buildings located in the Project 5 site. **(DEIR at 4.1-105)**.

The Project 5 site is located in the west/central portion of the Antelope Valley, and it is flat, sloping gradually downwards from southwest to northeast. The Project 5 site is fallow agricultural land, and is currently vacant. The existing site is currently open land in a rural area, and is typical of the surrounding landscape. The visual quality of the Project 5 site is low, and the site itself does not have unique or rare features, or hold special significance. The topography is uniform and flat. Vegetation is uniform and consists of non-native grasses and short shrubs. Two man-made drainage features were observed. A wash runs east/west down the center of the Project 5 site. Two-track marks are visible on aerial photographs on the Project 5 site. An electric distribution line is located across the street from the Project 5 site, on the north side of West Avenue I. A high-voltage transmission line with lattice towers is located adjacent to the Project site's eastern boundary. **(DEIR at 4.1-51)**.

Rural development and public infrastructure in the landscape surrounding the Project 5 site include farms, rural residences, agricultural fields, high-voltage power lines, PV solar fields, electrical distribution lines, roadways, and a large substation (the Antelope Substation). Existing PV solar fields are located approximately 1.8 miles east and 3.9 miles southeast of the Project 5 site. Development near the site is rural in nature. The closest residence is associated with a farm located approximately 380 feet to the west of the site along 120th Street West. The residence building is surrounded by tall trees, and symmetrical rows of planted trees occur between the residence and 120th Street West. There are several other rural residences located within 1 mile of the Project 5 site, along local roads. Most residences have a restricted view of the Project 5 site because of surrounding vegetation. **(DEIR at 4.1-51)**.

There are no designated scenic highways in the vicinity of the Project 5 site. The Project 5 SGF may be visible from 90th Street West and Avenue K between 90th Street West and 110th Street West, which are identified as potential scenic routes in the City of Lancaster's MEA. However, neither of these roadways has been designated as a scenic route. It is highly unlikely that the SGF would be discernible from Little Buttes or Quartz Hill, which are both located over eight miles from the Project 5 site. Even though viewpoints from Little Buttes and Quartz Hill are at higher elevations than the Project 5 site, from this distance the proposed Project would fade into the flat landscape. DEIR Figure 4.1-25 shows a view from Quartz Hill in the direction of the site. As is seen from the photo, individual features and patterns beyond the residential developments in Lancaster are not discernible. **(DEIR at 4.1-52)**.

Project 5 would be visible from the trails and vistas associated with the Foothills Area, and may be visible from higher elevations in the California Poppy Reserve where views are not blocked by terrain. If the SGF was visible from that distance, it would not appear dissimilar to an agricultural field or the Antelope Substation in size and shape after construction. Other scenic resources identified by the City of Lancaster are located a sufficient distance away such that after construction the SGF would fade into the horizon line and not be visible. The SGF may be visible from sections of West Avenue K and 90th Street West during and after construction. These roads were identified by the City of Lancaster as potential scenic routes, but are not currently designated as scenic routes. **(DEIR at 4.1-98)**.

Construction activities and equipment on the Project 5 site may be noticeable from vistas on top of and around the Foothills Area. During construction of the SGF, disturbance areas would appear as large patches of fine, buff-colored rock and soil. Construction activities may produce visible dust, but impacts would be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of the fugitive dust plan (Mitigation Measure A-1). Any trash, debris, and waste would be removed from the Project 5 site during construction, and the site would be screened or partially screened by fencing in accordance with Mitigation Measures A-2 and A-3. Adverse visual effects from construction would be temporary and last only during the construction time period, and less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures A-1, A-2, and A-3. **(DEIR at 4.1-98)**.

Because construction activities would be limited to daylight hours, impacts from nighttime lighting would not occur. Lighting will comply with the Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Therefore, the impacts would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure A-5. Because of the low height of the solar modules, no significant shadows would be cast upon nearby sensitive land uses. The SGF would not create a significant source of light. Light sources associated with the SGF would be minimal, and would be restricted to that required for nighttime safety and security according to County requirements and would comply with all requirements of the Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Only permitted types of lights would be used and specified height limits employed. Lighting would be installed and directed downward and shielded to avoid light trespass. The amount of light generated by the security lights would be consistent with the provisions of the new Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance, and would allow less light trespass than existing sources of light produced by man-made structures adjacent to the proposed site, including residences, roadway lights, and other existing nearby facilities. Motion sensors and time limits would be employed per the lighting ordinance. Project components would introduce minimal amounts of glare to the existing landscape. The PV modules are designed to absorb sunlight, and the glass modules that protect the PV surface are typically formulated glass designed to allow sunlight to pass with minimal reflection. Impacts from new sources of light or glare will be less than significant with Mitigation Measure A-5. **(DEIR at 4.1-113)**.

The Project 5 SGF would not impact any designated scenic routes. The SGF may be visible during and after construction from sections of 90th Street West and West Avenue K, which are identified by the City of Lancaster as potential scenic routes, but are not currently designated as such. Existing vegetation and infrastructure (including high-voltage transmission lines, PV solar fields, residences/farms, and the Antelope Substation) are located in between the Project 5 site

and 90th Street West, and would provide some degree of visual screening during and after construction. Views from 90th Street West to the mountains would not be impeded. West Avenue K is considered a potential scenic route for views to the south of the San Gabriel Mountains and Portal Ridge foothills, and the SGF would not impede these views. High-voltage transmission lines and ranches/farms are located in between Avenue K and the Project 5 site, and would provide some degree of visual screening. Because of the distance, even if the SGF is visible from this section of Avenue K, it would not be prominent in the landscape. **(DEIR at 4.1-98)**. No trails are located on the Project 5 site. Therefore, the SGF would not cause the vacation of any portion of any trail. **(DEIR at 4.1-104)**.

After construction, the Project 5 SGF would be visible from the Foothills Area but would not be a dominant element in the landscape unless the viewer was directly adjacent to the facility. At 8 feet tall, the PV modules are relatively short, and given their design, which absorbs sunlight instead of reflecting it, the modules would not be highly reflective. From viewing points not directly adjacent to the site and at approximately the same elevation as the SGF, the SGF would fade into the flat landscape and not dominate the view after construction. In addition, other electric infrastructure, including the Antelope Substation and several high-voltage transmission lines, are also located within two miles of the Project 5 site. Because this existing electrical infrastructure is also visible from scenic vistas such as the Foothills Area, Project 5 and its gen-tie line would not significantly degrade views from nearby scenic vistas. The SGF would be prominent in views along the Class III bikeway located along West Avenue I, and may also be visible from 90th Street West, and West Avenue J. However, a 10-foot vegetative buffer would be located along the northern boundary of the Project site for 0.5 mile where it is adjacent to the Class III bikeway to screen the view from the bikeway, as required by Mitigation Measure A-4. The SGF and gen-tie line would not degrade the scenic character around the bikeways because it is not out-of-character when considering the context of the surrounding landscape. Rural development and public infrastructure are common in the landscape around the site and include rural residences, agricultural fields, residential developments, and electrical infrastructure such as existing PV solar fields, electric distribution lines, and high-voltage transmission lines. Overall, the Project would have a less than significant impact with mitigation. **(DEIR at 4.1-99, 4.1-104)**.

A contrast rating was conducted from the viewpoint shown in DEIR Figure 4.1-36 to assess the level of contrast that would be introduced by Project 5 to landform, vegetation, or structures in terms of major landform characteristics (form, line, color, and texture). The height, bulk, pattern, and scale of the SGF were considerations in the contrast rating process, which determined that the overall level of contrast introduced by the Project 5 SGF would be moderate. No noticeable modifications to landforms are anticipated. The removal of vegetation (the shrubs on the south side of the road) would introduce a weak level of contrast compared with existing conditions. The introduction of solar modules would create a moderate level of contrast compared with existing conditions. Although the solar modules would introduce a new infrastructure element to the landscape, the colors of the modules already exist in the environment, and the horizontal lines created by the rows of solar modules mimic the naturally flat lines of the foreground landscape. **(DEIR at 4.1-110)**.

Viewers such as nearby residents and travelers on West Avenue I would still experience views of the open desert lands around the site after the solar facility is constructed. The residence located closest to the solar facility (along 120th Street West) is separated from the site by rows of planted trees. The solar facility would not significantly impact views from this residence because of screening or partial screening provided by the vegetation. The SGF is not out-of-character with the surrounding landscape when considering the context of the larger Project 5 area. Rural development and public infrastructure are common in the landscape around the Project 5 site. The Project 5 site is located within 2 miles of an existing PV solar field, and approximately 1.9 miles west of the Antelope Substation, which has a footprint that is a similar size and shape compared to the proposed site. The electrical infrastructure on the Antelope Substation is much more complex with varying heights and shapes of equipment, while the SGF would appear very uniform throughout the site. Several distribution lines and high-voltage transmission lines converge at the Antelope Substation. Other modifications in the landscape include farms and residences. Because other structures including PV solar facilities are common in the vicinity of the site and in the larger Project 5 area, and because the site itself is not characterized by high visual quality, the visual impact of the site on the existing visual character of the proposed site and its surroundings would be less than significant, and Project 5 would have a less than significant impact with mitigation. **(DEIR at 4.1-111)**.

Project 5's visual impacts are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

A-1 A Fugitive Dust Control Plan to minimize dust (visual pollution) shall be prepared and implemented.

A-2 The Project site shall be maintained free of debris, trash, and waste during construction.

A-3 The Project site shall be visually screened or partially screened during construction by fencing.

A-4 A landscape plan shall be developed for each Project prior to Project construction that shows the detail of a 10-foot wide screening vegetation buffer intended to screen or partially screen the Project visually from area residents or travelers on nearby roadways.

A-5 All lighting shall comply with applicable provisions of the Los Angeles County Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Lights shall be limited to types allowed by the ordinance, installed below maximum allowed heights, pointed downwards and shielded to minimize light trespass, and mounted on essential infrastructure rather than on separate light poles except where poles are required by regulation or by governing agency. Lighting will comply with the hours of operation requirements in the ordinance, and utilize automatic control devices to comply with time limits except where permitted by Los Angeles County. Lighting will be maintained in good repair at all times.

2.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 5 would have a significant impact on Agriculture and Forestry Resources if it would: convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use; conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract; conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)); result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or 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.

Finding:

Project 5 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Agriculture and Forestry Resources. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

As currently mapped under 2010 data from the Department of Conservation ("DOC") Farmland Monitoring and Mapping Program ("FMMP"), the Project 5 site contains no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. **(DEIR at 4.2-5)**. Project 5 also contains no forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. **(DEIR at 4.2-8)**.

Project 5 is located within the Los Angeles County Zoning Ordinance designation A-2, Heavy Agriculture. According to LACDRP, a solar electricity energy generating facility is allowed in Zone A-2 with the issuance of a CUP (Chapter 22.24.150[A]). Furthermore, Project 5 will not preclude future agricultural uses. Project 5 and its associated gen-tie lines are located within a LACDRP Agricultural Opportunity Area ("AOA"). The Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan Policy states that these areas should be protected from incompatible uses. The Antelope Valley Area Plan states that applications for non-agricultural uses in the AOA areas will be evaluated for their impact upon adjacent agricultural operations.

Project 5 would involve conversion of land that was formerly used for agricultural production to renewable electricity energy production. Construction and operation of Project 5 would not involve other restrictions, obstructions, or resources that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. The Project 5 site has not been irrigated since 1972. The Project would produce power in a passive manner and would result in minimal air pollutant emissions, traffic, and noise, and would not affect adjacent agricultural operations.

Project 5 and its associated gen-tie lines are located in an AOA, but are not currently utilized for agricultural purposes. Additionally, the proposed properties are not designated under a

Williamson Act contract. As a result, construction and operation of Project 5 would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, impacts to existing agricultural use zoning, designated AOAs, and Williamson Act contracts will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-7)**.

Project 5 and its associated gen-tie lines will temporarily preclude future agricultural use at the Project 5 site. Following the termination of power generating activities at the Project 5 site, all facilities and equipment would be removed and the land would be restored as near to its pre-development condition as possible in the event a new similar land use is not contemplated at that time by then current owners. A decommissioning and reclamation plan detailing land restoration activities will be provided, as required by Los Angeles County as part of the CUP. Additionally, the Applicant will be required to provide a decommissioning bond, or other suitable financial guarantee acceptable to the County, equal to the amount of money estimated to be required to decommission the Project, including any additional environmental review which might become necessary, and restore the land to as near its pre-development condition as possible. Project 5 will not impact any land use outside the development site's limits. Impacts regarding the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-9)**.

2.3 AIR QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Project 5 would have a significant impact on Air Quality if it would: conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; cumulatively produce a considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors); expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 5 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Air Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Pursuant to the Clean Air Act ("CAA"), the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District ("AVAQMD") is required to reduce project emissions of criteria pollutants for which the Mojave Desert Air Basin ("MDAB") is in non-attainment. Project 5 is located within a non-attainment area, which means that certain Project-related activities could potentially be subject to emission control strategies contained within the AVAQMD Federal 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan. Construction would involve activities that can result in emissions of particulate matter ("PM"). However, construction of PV panels and the generation-tie line would not require intense

earthmoving activities, only the low-impact method of mowing the surface. Compliance with applicable rules, ordinances, plans, and policies would minimize PM emissions during construction. Project 5 construction emissions would not exceed emission thresholds, and would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-29)**. Since construction of Projects 1-6 would occur consecutively over the course of two years, construction of the six Projects could overlap, which may cause a peak in the Projects' daily construction emissions. However, maximum daily and annual construction emissions would not exceed the appropriate AVAQMD significant thresholds for all pollutants, even with the potential overlap in construction schedules. **(DEIR at 4.3-37)**.

During operation of Project 5, the Project site would undergo maintenance and security activities no more than 10 times annually (as needed), and would not create a daily increase in population or visitors. The assumption of 10 annual trips includes truck trips associated with panel washing. Project 5 would comply with AVAQMD rules and Los Angeles County ordinances, and is designed to be consistent with applicable county policies and the Attainment Plan. Therefore, Project 5 would not conflict with implementing the applicable air quality plan. **(DEIR at 4.3-25; 4.3-40)**.

Project 5 emissions estimates are based on compliance with AVAQMD Rule 403 requirements for fugitive dust suppression, watering exposed surfaces two times daily. The short-term emissions during Project 5 construction would not exceed AVAQMD significance thresholds. As such, Project 5 would not exceed thresholds, result in violating air quality standards, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. **(DEIR at 4.3-28)**. Likewise, even when all six Projects operate concurrently, the operation of all six Projects would not exceed annual thresholds, violate air quality standards, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. **(DEIR at 4.3-42)**.

Decommissioning of Project 5 (and each of the six Project sites) would require removal of the PV modules, PV module mounting system, electrical boxes, electrical inverters and transformers, electrical AC collection system, switchgear, data monitoring equipment, chain link perimeter security fencing, concrete ballasts, underground vaults, other concrete pads, and transporting all components off site. Air quality emissions from decommissioning would be generated from the pieces of equipment used and any fugitive dust from site preparation activities. Equipment used for decommissioning and removal of concrete ballasts, underground vaults, concrete pads, etc. generally would be similar to that used for construction, except that no mowing or clearing would be required.

Since decommissioning does not involve mowing or clearing activities, the level of fugitive dust emissions would be less than emissions created during construction. After removal of equipment and facilities, the site would need to be re-vegetated. Decommissioning would occur after at least 25 years of operation; therefore, equipment engine technology is likely to be more advanced, and fuels to be cleaner. Criteria pollutant emissions during decommissioning would be equal to or, more likely, less than those estimated from construction for Project 5, and will also be less than significant with mitigation. **(DEIR at 4.3-42)**. Similar to criteria pollutant emissions, hazardous air pollutant emissions during decommissioning would be less than during construction due to advanced equipment engine technology and cleaner fuel and would therefore be less than

significant. Exhaust from off-road equipment and on-road vehicles used during decommissioning and construction truck trips would not be expected to create objectionable odors, and would therefore be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-42).**

The MDAB is currently nonattainment for federal and state ozone standards and nonattainment for state PM_{10} standards, which may cause emissions from Project 5 to contribute to an existing or projected air quality standard exceedance. Implementing any of the six Projects (including Project 5) would increase short-term emissions related to construction, and a negligible increase in long-term emissions related to SGF operation and maintenance. Construction for all six sites is expected to be staggered, and may extend over two years. Nevertheless, due to the nature and size of each site, simultaneous construction would not result in emissions of ozone precursors or PM_{10} that exceed daily thresholds. As shown in DEIR Table 4.3-12, "Mitigated Peak Daily Concurrent Construction Emissions", and DEIR Table 4.3-13, "Peak Annual Concurrent Construction Emissions", the impacts would be less than significant prior to mitigation. Implementing control strategies to reduce PM_{10} further minimizes air emissions. As such, construction of Project 5 would not 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). **(DEIR at 4.3-43)**.

During the operation phase, Project 5 will have no major emissions sources. Facility operating equipment that emits regulated air pollutants or requires AVAQMD permits is not planned at Project 5 or any of the six Project sites. As shown in DEIR Table 4.3-20, "Peak Annual Concurrent Operation Emissions", the impacts would be less than significant. As such, operation of Project 5 would not 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). **(DEIR at 4.3-43)**.

Project 5 was analyzed for air impacts to nearby sensitive receptors; however, sensitive receptors would only be exposed during construction activities. PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations are expected to occur primarily from fugitive dust emissions during mowing, excavation activities and, to a lesser degree, during PV installation and paving. Rule 401 requires that airborne particles remain on the site from which they originate under normal wind conditions. Proper mitigation techniques must be implemented to ensure that fugitive dust is contained. Emissions are not expected to expose even the closest sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and, due to the distance between Project sites, simultaneous construction at two sites would not significantly impact the same sensitive receptors. **(DEIR at 4.3-44)**.

Operational emissions from Project 5 would not impact local air pollutant levels at nearby receptors. As mentioned above, sensitive receptors would only be exposed, if at all, during construction activities. The primary source of Project emissions during operation is the vehicles used by facility maintenance staff traveling to and from the site. Maintenance is expected to occur no more than 10 times per year. Overall, Project 5 would not result in an increase in VMT over the course of one summer or winter day. Thus, Project 5 would not result in new long-term stationary sources, nor would they result in a significant number of net new vehicular trips.

Carbon monoxide (CO) impacts from operation of Project 5 to sensitive receptors would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-44)**.

Short-term concentration levels during the construction phase will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, including those resulting in a cancer risk greater than the EPA screening levels. **(DEIR at 4.3-45)**. Due to continuous construction of each of the six Project sites over the course of two years (which may overlap), long-term cancer impacts from construction activities to the nearest sensitive receptors were evaluated, and found that even with the cumulative contribution of health risk impacts from all six proposed Projects, the cumulative cancer risk to the identified sensitive receptors is still below the cancer risk exposure level. **(DEIR at 4.3-46)**. Short-term concentration levels during Project 5 site construction will neither expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, nor exceed the cancer risk screening levels. **(DEIR at 4.3-47)**.

Project 5's Air Quality impacts are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

AQ-1 Water active sites at least twice daily (locations where soil disturbance is to occur would be thoroughly watered before earthmoving) during construction, or, in locations where water alone does not suffice to suppress dust adequately apply nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers, according to manufacturers' specifications. Temporarily stockpiled soil shall be secured with tarps or plastic sheeting or sprayed with non-toxic soil stabilizers.

AQ-2 All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).

AQ-3 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.

AQ-4 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not idle more than five minutes in any one hour.

AQ-5 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operation of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.

AQ-6 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.

AQ-7 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.

AQ-8 During array area preparation, mowing shall be used instead of grading and/or disking, and shall be limited to no more than 3.5 acres per day per site to further reduce dust emissions during construction.

AQ-9 All interior roads shall use long-lasting non-toxic chemical soil stabilizers designed for long-term dust stabilization on dirt roads.

AQ-10 Interior array areas shall have re-established pre-existing vegetation or be established with drought tolerant, native, or native compatible vegetation approved by the County biologist and compliant with Fire Department requirements, within two years of energization authorization of an array area by the Department of Public Works, Building and Safety Division, to provide long-term dust stabilization under the arrays.

AQ-11 Earth disturbing activities shall be suspended and/or additional water shall be applied to meet Rule 403 criteria if wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour.

AQ-12 Construction activity shall utilize electricity from power poles on or adjacent to the Project sites rather than use of temporary diesel power generators and/or gasoline power generators when electricity with adequate circuit capacity is available from power poles in proximity to construction areas.

AQ-13 In the event temporary night lighting is necessary for construction or maintenance purposes, lighting not requiring the use of diesel or gasoline driven generators shall be used.

2.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 5 would have a significant impact on biological resources if it would: 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 Wildlife ("CDFW") or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ("USFWS"); have a substantial adverse effect on sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations of CDFW or USFWS; have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including marshes, vernal pools, and coastal wetlands) or waters of the United States, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; 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; convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, southern California

black walnut, etc.); conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas ("SEAs") (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Section 22.56.215), and the Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas ("SERAs"), (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Section 22.44, Part 6); or conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 5 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Biological Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 5 does not contain riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, wetlands, Joshua trees, or yucca trees on the site, and does not contain non-jurisdictional or state regulated waters. **(DEIR at 4.4-59)**. There are no wetlands, vernal pools, or riparian habitat identified on the Project 5 site. No federally protected wetlands (including marshes, vernal pools, and coastal wetlands) or waters of the United States, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act features, were identified on the Project 5 site. The natural swales located on Project 5 do not support riparian vegetation or riparian habitats. **(DEIR at 4.4-61)**.

Valley needlegrass grasslands were identified on portions of the Project 5 site. Valley needlegrass grasslands are considered a sensitive vegetation type by CDFW, and are protected by the City of Lancaster and Los Angeles County. Mitigation lands being selected would replace the habitat lost for Valley Needlegrass, and efforts to reseed this plant on site would also be made by including these seeds in the land reclamation seed mix. **(DEIR at 4.4-59)**.

Project 5 does not contain oak trees, juniper trees, Joshua trees, or other unique native trees aside from a minimal number of juniper trees. Juniper trees will be avoided if possible; however, in considering mitigation lands to be selected, lands with important habitat elements such as native trees will be sought. **(DEIR at 4.4-62, 63)**. Project 5 and the immediate vicinity do not contain or conflict with any Significant Ecological Areas ("SEAs"), Wildflower Reserve Areas, or Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas ("SERAs"). The closest SEAs to Project 5 are the Portal Ridge-Liebre Mountain, which is 3.5 miles west, and Fairmont and Antelope Buttes which are 3.42 miles south. Therefore, Project 5 would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. **(DEIR at 4.4-64)**. There are no adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plans in effect within the boundaries of the Project 5 site. **(DEIR at 4.4-64)**.

The Project 5 site has low potential for Peirson's morning glory, American badger, loggerhead shrike, merlin, mountain plover, southern grasshopper mouse, and ferruginous and Swainson's hawk to occur onsite. There is moderate potential for the coast horned lizard to occur on site. There is low potential for the burrowing owl to occur onsite, as no individuals or suitable burrows were observed during 2013 targeted burrowing owl surveys. Developing the site as a solar generating facility would remove habitat for these species, which is a potentially significant

impact as the 160 acres of land for Project 5 would be mostly unavailable as wildlife habitat during the life of Project 5. However, this impact is less than significant with mitigation. **(DEIR at 4.4-59)**.

Project 5 is located within an area of topographically homogeneous open space, and is also near a crossing of the California Aqueduct. Lighting, fencing, and increased human activity related to construction and operation would have the potential to impact the continued viability of this crossing for numerous wildlife species. Wildlife nursery areas on the Project 5 site may include nesting sites of native bird species, which are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-712; Ch. 128; July 13, 1918; 40 Stat. 755) and the California Fish and Game Code Section 3503. Burrowing owls may have suitable burrows on the sites and protections for bird nesting and burrowing owls are provided in Mitigation Measures B-1, B-2, B-3 and B-4. The intent of acquiring mitigation lands would be to select available parcels that would replace lost breeding/foraging/winter foraging habitat and enhance the overall quality of habitat for a variety of species including migratory bird species. The potential to acquire parcels that would also maintain or enhance wildlife migration corridors in the area would also be considered. Planting of shrubs and native vegetation on the Project 5 site would improve the opportunities for shrub-nesting bird species on the Project 5 site when it is complete. The implementation of Mitigation Measure A-6 described in Section 4.1 Aesthetics, provides for the preparation of a lighting plan to minimize fugitive light from security lighting on the site. **(DEIR at 4.4-62)**.

Project 5 impacts to Biological Resources are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

B-1: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a qualified biologist shall be retained by the Applicant as the lead biological monitor subject to the approval of the LACDRP and CDFW. That person shall ensure that impacts to all biological resources are minimized or avoided, and shall conduct (or supervise) pre-grading field surveys for species that may be avoided, affected, or eliminated as a result of grading or any other site preparation activities. The lead biological monitor shall ensure that all surveys are conducted by qualified personnel (e.g. avian biologists for bird surveys, herpetologists for reptile surveys, etc.) and that they possess all necessary permits and memoranda of understanding with the appropriate agencies for the handling of potentially-occurring special-status species. The lead biological monitor shall also ensure that daily monitoring reports (e.g., survey results, protective actions, results of protective actions, adaptive measures, etc.) are prepared, and shall make these monitoring reports available to LACDRP and CDFW at their request.

B-2: Pre-Construction surveys will be conducted prior to ground disturbance at each project site. These surveys will include all special-status species identified as having the potential to be present on the project site; including, but not limited to, badger, kit fox, southern grasshopper mouse, and the species listed below.

Pre-survey information gathering will include review of all available agency nest data and mapping.

- A focused pre-construction Swainson's hawk survey shall be conducted to locate any nesting sites within 5 miles of Projects 1 – 6. If Swainson's hawks or their active nests are located within 500 feet of the project sites, all construction-related work shall be postponed and CDFW will be consulted.

- Project-related activities likely to have the potential of disturbing suitable bird nesting habitat, which includes ground nesting birds, shall be prohibited from February 1 through August 31, unless a qualified monitoring biologist conducts nesting bird surveys prior to any construction-related disturbance to confirm the absence of active bird nests or bird nesting habitat. Disturbance shall be defined as any activity that physically removes or damages vegetation or habitat or any action that may cause disruption of nesting behavior such as loud noise from equipment or artificial night lighting. Surveys shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. If an active bird nest is discovered, disturbance within 500 feet for raptors shall be postponed until the nest is vacated, offspring are independent of the nest area and there is no evidence of further attempts at nesting. Limits of avoidance shall be marked with high-visibility flagging or fencing. The Applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures and submit the records to LACDRP and CDFW to document compliance with applicable state and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds.

- A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted on each site prior to grading. Pre-construction surveys for burrowing owl shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. The surveys shall follow the protocols set forth by the California Burrowing Owl Consortium (1993 and 2012).

  If burrowing owls are found during the pre-construction survey, then replacement burrows and habitat must be provided prior to the commencement of construction. The Applicant shall be prepared to provide artificial replacement burrows in the event that owls are detected, either as wintering or breeding individuals.

  Wintering individuals may be evicted with the use of exclusion devices followed by a period of seven days to ensure that animals have left their burrows. When it can be assured that owls are no longer using the burrows, the burrows can be hand-excavated and collapsed under the supervision of the avian biologist.

  Breeding owls must not be disturbed and must be allowed to complete the raising of young until the fledglings can forage independently of adults and it can be confirmed that further attempts at nesting shall not be undertaken. When this has been confirmed, the owls can be evicted as described above for wintering animals.

- Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for special-status ground-dwelling reptiles, including but not limited to coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard. Surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground 4 to 6 weeks in

advance of the survey effort, checking weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles or other species determined important by the qualified biological monitor (i.e., biologist must be appropriately permitted for collection and relocation activities) occurring within the work area prior to the start of work shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.

B-3: During grading, earthmoving activities, and other construction activities the biological monitor shall be present to inspect and enforce all mitigation requirements and to relocate any species that may come into harm's way to an appropriate offsite location of similar habitat. The biological monitor shall be authorized to stop specific grading or construction activities if violations of mitigation measures or any local, state, or federal laws are suspected. The biological monitor shall file a report of the monitoring activities with LACDRP and CDFW during construction activities, as frequently as required by LACDRP and CDFW. If ongoing biological monitoring of construction activities reveals the presence of any special-status reptiles within an active work area, then work shall be temporarily halted until the animals can be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones. Work areas shall be surveyed for special-status reptile species, such as the coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard, during construction activities. During the construction, surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground in appropriate work areas and checking them weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles occurring within the work area shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.

B-4: Mitigation lands shall be acquired for Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, special-status migratory and wintering birds, and alkali mariposa lily.

Swainson's hawk: Impacts due to development of the projects shall be mitigated by the acquisition of good quality Swainson's hawk habitat targeted within the Antelope Valley. Land shall be purchased or placed in a conservation easement or other suitable deed restriction and managed to maintain suitable habitat in perpetuity.

The proposed development is not expected to result in the "take" of Swainson's hawk; however, the Applicant shall be required to consult CDFW in the event of take, which may result in additional mitigation prescribed by CDFW. Although the Projects are not expected to result in "take" of Swainson's hawk, mitigation will still be required to alleviate the effects of cumulative impacts on raptor, migratory bird, and burrowing owl habitats:

Replacement land will be provided based on the quality of the mitigation land relative to the impacted habitat. The ratio of such replacement shall be determined as follows:

- A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 3 acres of development if the replacement land is superior nesting and foraging habitat contiguous to occupied nesting and foraging habitat, and is within a designated or proposed SEA.

- A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 2 acres of development if the replacement land is unoccupied irrigated land, contiguous to occupied habitat and providing superior quality foraging habitat with trees or other such nesting habitat;

- A ratio of 1 acre of replacement land for each acre of development if the replacement land provides similar foraging and nesting habitat.

Burrowing Owl: Mitigation for any occupied burrowing owl burrows found during preconstruction surveys will include a comprehensive tiered approach:

- Pre-construction and construction monitoring surveys conducted by a qualified biologist to detect potential new owl activity onsite;

- Disturbance avoidance of occupied burrows during nesting period February 1 – August 31;

- Impact avoidance of occupied burrows;

- Burrow exclusion and closure and offsite relocation (>100 m), as described previously in in B-2, will be conducted for unavoidable impacts to occupied burrows (after consultation with CDFW).

- Minimizing impacts by protecting in-place any owls, their burrows, and their immediate habitat by establishing setback zones and visual screens for burrows adjacent to construction activity; by placing visible markers, and by conducting construction worker awareness training. Setback widths will be applied as appropriate to the level of existing disturbance and owl stage of activity (e.g., for low to moderate construction-related disturbance activity outside the nesting season near burrows in currently high-traffic or disturbance areas, it is assumed owls are adapted to human disturbance and will not need a large setback).

- Mitigating unavoidable impacts to habitat: restore temporary impacts to pre-existing conditions; replace nesting/occupied and satellite burrows lost with the same number of suitable burrows on the mitigation site. Mitigation acreage for foraging habitat provided for Swainson's hawk will be sufficient to replace lost burrowing owl habitat because the hawk's replacement habitat will be in-kind or better (i.e., the Project habitat is low quality overall and mitigation habitat will be at least the same quality as the lost habitat OR will have higher quality habitat features overall, such as increased vegetative structure, higher numbers of prey species, less disturbance, and less potential for predation by domestic animals, etc.). Specific habitat considerations as provided in the CDFW 2012 burrowing owl guidance will be considered in selecting the overall habitat replacement acres for the project.

Alkali Mariposa Lily: Alkali mariposa lily will be avoided to the greatest extent possible. If preconstruction surveys reveal individuals that cannot be avoided, mitigation of lost alkali mariposa lily shall be provided at a minimum 1:1 ratio. This acreage will be calculated with input from LACDRP and CDFW. Additionally, because alkali mariposa Lilies have locally available seed sources, plantings of the lilies on appropriate soil types on Projects shall be

implemented in selected areas. The lilies may also be transplanted from areas planned for disturbance to more suitable locations in the Project area. Transplantation locations must be situated within adequately buffered areas to be found suitable.

For all species the mitigation acreage may be located within the Project sites, but outside of the area of development, subject to LACDRP and CDFW approval, if acreage of sufficient quantity and quality exists.

B-5: Review and Approval of Habitat Management Lands Prior to Acquisition: The Applicant shall provide a mitigation land acquisition proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for their approval before acquiring the property. The proposal shall discuss the suitability of the property by comparing it to the selection criteria. As a part of the preparation of the land acquisition proposal, acreage quantification by habitat category will be developed with LACDRP and CDFW based on the following criteria:

> **Habitat Management Land Selection Criteria**: The Applicant must identify the region within which lands shall be acquired, and the type and quality of habitat to be acquired.
>
> Detailed criteria and acreage for each habitat category will be developed with Los Angeles County and CDFW. Foraging habitat shall be assessed as moderate to good with a capacity to improve in quality and value to Swainson's hawks, and must be within the Antelope Valley Swainson's hawk breeding range. Foraging habitat with suitable nest trees is preferred.
>
> **Habitat Management Lands Acquisition:** Prior to initiating ground-disturbing activities, the Applicant shall provide a proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for off-site mitigation land to be restored, enhanced, or maintained according to the requirements of the biological mitigation measures in this EIR. The proposal will require that mitigation lands identified shall be preserved as open space in perpetuity. Within 45 days of acquiring the mitigation land(s), the Applicant shall record a permanent deed restriction on the mitigation land(s) to be preserved as open space. The deed restriction or conservation easement language shall be submitted to LACDRP and CDFW for review and approval prior to recordation. Alternatively, should a conservation easement on the mitigation land be offered, the permanent conservation easement shall be recorded to the satisfaction of LACDRP and CDFW.
>
> The Applicant shall establish a fund sufficient for the restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation land(s) until such time when the mitigation land(s) become self-sustaining and until such time as the mitigation land(s) meet the requirements of this mitigation measure. The fund shall be established within 90 days of mitigation land(s) acquisition in an amount acceptable to the LACDRP and CDFW.
>
> **Land Acquisition Schedule and Financial Assurances**: The Applicant shall complete acquisition, or execute an irrevocable option to purchase, of proposed Habitat Management lands and shall provide financial assurances for dedicating adequate funding for impact avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, if necessary, prior to the issuance of building permits. If an irrevocable option to purchase is utilized, the

Applicant shall provide a proposed date of purchase which coincides with construction of the facility.

B-6: Prior to alteration of any streambeds, the Applicant shall enter into an agreement with the CDFW, pursuant to Sections 1601 through 1603 of the State Fish and Game Code.

B-7: Within all interior portions of the site within and adjacent to the proposed solar arrays, re-vegetation shall be accomplished (excluding interior roads) as follows:

Vegetation seeded in these areas shall comprise locally-sourced, native species if available, or, native compatible as approved by the County biologist if sufficient locally-sourced native seed stock is not available, approximating low-growing communities such as native perennial or annual grasslands (i.e., wildflower fields). Shrub species shall not be used due to these species inability to survive continued vegetation trimming. Vegetation shall be maintained in accordance with Los Angeles County Fire Department regulations.

2.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 5 would have a significant effect on Cultural Resources or Paleontological Resources if it would: cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5; cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 5 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Cultural Resources and Paleontological Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

No historical or archaeological resources were detected within Project 5 during the transect survey conducted for the EIR. Four previously recorded sites were identified during the record search and revisited during the transect surveys of the proposed gen-tie options 1 and 2. Previously recorded site P19-004250 is within gen-tie option 1A-D and 2A-D, and was recommended as not eligible for listing to the California Register of Historic Resources ("CRHR"). Previously recorded sites P19-004249, P19-186876, and P19-003477 are within proposed gen-tie options 1B and 1D, 2B and 2D, and were all recommended as not eligible for listing to the CRHR. None of these sites were recommended for listing due to the fact that they either do not meet the formal definitions of a historical resource or unique archaeological resource as defined by CEQA; because they are comparatively recent (early to mid-20th century)

and have little potential to yield additional data; or otherwise do not meet the requisite criteria for listing. Therefore, construction, operation and maintenance of Project 5 will not cause any change in the significance of historical or archaeological resources. **(DEIR at 4.5-25)**.

There is a possibility that historical and/or archaeological materials would be uncovered during necessary subsurface excavations for the construction of the proposed Project 5. Although the likelihood of encountering archaeological resources on the site is considered low, this impact is potentially significant. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, which describes procedures to be followed in the event that cultural resources are discovered, is required. CUL-1 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-26)**.

No paleontological resources were detected during the transect survey of Project 5. Based on the paleontological assessment conducted for the EIR, it is unlikely that any intact significant paleontological resources are or will be located on the Project 5 site. Therefore, Project 5 would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources. If Project excavations reach 10 feet or more below current grade and reveal that older Quaternary deposits and/or the later Miocene deposits are exposed, there will be a higher potential for encountering significant vertebrate fossil remains. Deep cuts should be inspected by a qualified paleontologist in an attempt to identify the more sensitive older alluvial strata. **(DEIR at 4.5-30)**.

There is a possibility that paleontological materials would be uncovered if excavations for the construction of the proposed Project 5 reach a depth of 10 feet or more below current grade. Although the likelihood of encountering paleontological resources within the Project 5 area is considered low, this impact is potentially significant. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure PALEO-1, the development of a Paleontological Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Plan ("PRMMP") by a qualified paleontologist is required if construction excavation depth is below 10 feet or more below current grade. PALEO-1 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-30)**. Operation of Project 5 would not require any excavations to the depth of potential paleontological resources. There, operation of Project 5 would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources. **(DEIR at 4.5-30)**.

There is no indication that human remains are present within the boundaries of the Project 5 site. The records search and the field survey indicate no evidence of human remains on or near the sites. Project-related earth disturbance, however, has the potential to unearth previously undiscovered remains, resulting in a potentially significant impact. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2 that describes procedures to be followed in the event that human remains are discovered would ensure that impacts are reduced to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-32)**.

Project 5 impacts related to Cultural Resources are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

CUL-1: In the event cultural resources are encountered during construction of the Projects, all ground-disturbing activities within the vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall be notified of the find. The archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to recordation and excavation of the finds and evaluation and processing of the finds in accordance with § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of, but are not limited to, stone, bone, fossils, wood or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites.

If the resources are determined to be unique historic resources as defined under § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, Mitigation Measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate Mitigation Measures for significant resources could include but not be limited to avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds.

No further earthwork shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any archaeological artifacts recovered because of mitigation will be donated to a qualified scientific institution approved by the Lead Agency where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.

CUL-2: In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, California State Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 dictates that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to CEQA regulations and PRC § 5097.98. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.

PALEO-1: A qualified paleontologist shall be retained by the Applicant prior to excavations reaching 10 feet in depth or greater. The paleontologist shall develop and execute a PRMMP and supervise a paleontological monitor whom shall monitor all ground-disturbing activities associated with such excavations. The Program will outline the procedures to follow in regards to paleontological resources (e.g. monitoring protocols, curation, data recovery of fossils, reporting). If fossils are found during such excavation, the paleontological monitor shall be authorized to halt ground-disturbing activities within 25 feet of the find to allow evaluation of the find and determination of appropriate treatment according to the Program.

2.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Potential Effect:

Project 5 would have a significant effect on Geology and Soils if it would: expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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 active fault trace; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides; result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; 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; be located on expansive soil; have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater; or conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance or hillside design standards in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element.

Finding:

Project 5 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Geology and Soils. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 5 and the Project 5 gen-tie line are not located in an active or potentially active fault zone according to the California Geological Survey ("CGS") Seismic Hazard Zone Maps (CGS 2008) and Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map (CGS 2010). The closest fault zones are the San Andreas Fault Zone, which is located approximately 3.1 miles to the south southwest of the Project 5 site, and the Garlock Fault Zone, which is located approximately 20 miles northwest of the Project 5 site. Based on research and available information, Project 5 is susceptible to seismicity, but is not susceptible to fault rupture; therefore, impacts involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-14)**.

The United States Geological Survey ("USGS") National Seismic Hazard Map (2008) indicates that Project 5 and the Project 5 gen-tie line are located in an area mapped from 60 to 80 percent gravity for peak horizontal acceleration with a 10 percent probability of exceedance in the next 50 years. According to the USGS, and dependent on structural design, 10 percent gravity is the lower threshold at which damages to structures are likely to occur. Based on geologic and soil conditions at the site, the USGS Ground Motion Parameter Calculator indicates that Project 5 facilities will need to be designed to sustain spectral accelerations of approximately 0.7 to 1.646 percent gravity (USGS 2012). **(DEIR at 4.6-17)**.

Project 5 has the potential to be subjected to ground motion during construction. However, because of the temporary nature of the construction period relative to the frequency of occurrence of significant seismic events, the potential for Project 5 construction to expose people or structures to substantially adverse effects due to seismicity and ground motion will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-17)**. During operation of the facility, all Project 5 structures and operational facilities will be designed in accordance with the California Building Code ("CBC") and applicable industry standards. The design and construction of Project 5 would comply with all applicable building codes and standards established by regulatory agencies, including the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the CBC. Therefore, Project 5 impacts related to seismic shaking and strong ground motion hazards would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-18)**.

The CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) does not identify Project 5 or the Project 5 gen-tie line as being located in zones with the potential for liquefaction or ground failure. Additionally, Project 5 is located on poorly sorted coarse grained materials with groundwater typically greater than 100 feet below ground surface (bgs) (USGS 2008). Based on available geologic information, the potential susceptibility of ground failure is less than significant for Project 5 construction and operation. **(DEIR at 4.6-19)**.

The location of Project 5 and its associated gen-tie lines contain generally low slopes of less than 1 to 2 percent gradient. As indicated in the Project description, development of the solar facility would not result in significant changes to existing site grades, and would not increase the susceptibility to slope failure. Additionally, the CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) does not identify Project 5 as being located in zones susceptible to landslides or slope failure. Therefore, the potential susceptibility for slope failure and landslides during construction and operation is less than significant for Project 5. **(DEIR at 4.6-20)**.

The soil series at the location of Project 5 and the Project 5 gen-tie line was indicated to be Greenfield sandy loam and Ramona coarse sandy loam. These soil series have an erosion factor of 0.24 to 0.28, indicating a medium susceptibility to water erosion, and a wind erodibility group of 3, indicating a low to medium susceptibility to wind erosion. Implementation of appropriate erosion and sediment control BMPs will be implemented during construction and operation of Project 5, as outlined in Draft EIR Hydrology Section 4.9 and Air Quality Section 4.3, and will mitigate potential impacts to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.6-22)**.

Based on the information in the Geotechnical Critical Issues Analyses and Custom Soil Resource Reports prepared by Tetra Tech, the location of Project 5 and the Project 5 gen-tie line contains generally low gradient slopes. Development of solar facilities will not result in significant changes to existing site grades, and will not increase the susceptibility to slope failure. Additionally, the CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) indicates that Project 5 is not susceptible to landslide or liquefaction hazards. **(DEIR at 4.6-24)**.

Although subsidence has occurred throughout the Antelope Valley, the majority of subsidence has been concentrated near the City of Lancaster and was caused by excessive groundwater pumping and decreased water levels. Subsidence in the vicinity of Project 5 was between 0 to 3

feet from 1930 to 1992, and there has been no surficial evidence such as fissures and differential settling observed near the Project 5 location. Based on historic rates of subsidence and a relatively stabilizing water level due to reduced pumping and proposed aquifer management, future subsidence is expected to be minimal. In the event that minor future subsidence does occur, the potential impact to the proposed structural design (post mounted racking systems and relatively small foundations for electrical equipment) would be minimal. Based on geologic data and the proposed construction and operation as described in the Project description, Project 5 impacts to on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-24, 25)**.

The soil series at the location of Project 5 and the Project 5 gen-tie line was indicated to be Greenfield sandy loam and Ramona coarse sandy loam. This soil series is rated for a low shrink/swell potential, and the potential for expansive soils to affect Project 5 is less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-26)**. Project 5 does not propose the use of any sanitary facilities that will require septic tanks or sanitary wastewater disposal during either construction or operation. Therefore, no impact will occur. Project 5 is located on the floor of the Antelope Valley where the terrain is nearly flat. Project 5 is not located in the hillside area, and is not affected by Hillside Management Areas. **(DEIR at 4.6-26)**.

2.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Potential Effect:

Project 5 would have a significant impact related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change if it would: generate direct or indirect GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment, based on any applicable threshold of significance; or conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 5 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 5's short-term GHG emissions during the construction phase (maximum daily emissions of 5,450 pounds per day) would not exceed the AVAQMD significance threshold for maximum daily emissions (548,000 pounds per day). As such, Project 5 would not exceed thresholds or result in violating GHG standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected GHG violation. **(DEIR at 4.7-22)**.

Because construction of the six Project sites may overlap, concurrent construction emissions of Projects 1-6 were analyzed by emissions per year and thus compared to the annual GHG threshold of 100,000 metric tons of CO_{2e} per year, for long-term emissions. The unmitigated peak annual construction levels for all six Project sites are expected to result in annual GHG

emissions below the most stringent annual threshold proposed by the AVAQMD (100,000 tons per year). As such, the Project will not exceed thresholds or result in violating GHG standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected GHG violation. **(DEIR at 4.7-23)**.

During operations, Project 5 facility operation would be limited to general maintenance, panel washing, and security. The primary source of emissions during operations is mainly the vehicles used by facility maintenance staff to and from the site. It is anticipated that operations and maintenance would utilize one water truck for panel washing and one light duty truck twice per year. Although Project 5 is scheduled for bi-annual panel washing, a maximum of ten trips were assumed for each Project (four round trips plus one additional round trip to be conservative). The operation emissions provided for each Project are considered the Project's baseline emissions, since it does not include any solar energy reductions. Because operations-related GHG emissions are considered long term, the AVAQMD daily significance threshold of 100,000 metric tons of CO_{2e} per year was used to analyze impacts during operations. The total annual operational emissions for Project 5 are 3.43 tons of CO_{2e} per year, which is well below the AVAQMD threshold of 100,000 tons per year. **(DEIR at 4.7-26)**. Likewise, concurrent operation of all six Projects is estimated to generate approximately 31 metric tons of CO_{2e} annually, which is well below the AVAQMD threshold. **(DEIR at 4.7-27)**.

Construction-related emissions from Project 5 would be temporary and finite in nature, below the applicable thresholds, and are consistent with the AB 32 Scoping Plan. Accordingly, Project 5's construction-related GHG emissions would not be a cumulatively considerable contribution to climate change. Project 5's operational GHG emissions would be negligible and would not comprise a cumulatively considerable contribution to climate change and, therefore, would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.7-28).**

Furthermore, with implementation of Project 5, there would be an added environmental benefit of displacing GHG emissions in the region. The solar energy generation would offset emissions from electricity usage, which would otherwise be produced by fossil-fueled power generation facilities using petroleum, natural gas, or coal combustion. Project 5 would result in a temporary increase in GHG emissions which is below the most stringent proposed threshold; employ active solar technologies supportive of the state's goals to reduce GHG emissions; and is consistent with the County of Los Angeles's goals. **(DEIR at 4.7-29)**.

Project 5 would therefore be in accordance with the state's need for the construction of renewable energy power plants to meet the state's GHG reduction objectives including:

- California's RPS that requires California's investor-owned electric utilities to obtain 20 percent of the electricity that they supply by 2010 from renewable sources;

- Executive Order S-14-08, which established the RPS targets for California that "all retail sellers of electricity shall serve 33 percent of their load with renewable energy by 2020";

- Executive Order S-03-05 on climate change to advance renewable energy and other solutions to reduce California's GHG emissions; and

- The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) that established a comprehensive program of regulatory and market mechanisms to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020.

Project 5 includes various project design features and objectives that address global climate change and reduce GHG emissions, as do each of the Projects 1-6. Project design features include aspects of the Project that either must be incorporated as part of the conditions of approval, or that the Applicant has committed to include to reduce GHG impacts associated with the Project. The Projects would be designed to reduce emissions through specific goals set. The expected Project features would directly or indirectly result in lower emissions of GHGs. The Project design features that address global climate change impacts include the following:

- Vegetation to sequester GHGs
    - Preserve natural areas by mowing, which maintains the organic material in the soil
    - Preserve open space by limiting constructing on portions of Project site
    - Plant trees and shrubs along the edges as buffers to adjacent receptors

- Construction limitations to minimize GHG emissions
    - Limit construction equipment idling beyond regulation requirements
    - Limit number of simultaneous construction projects by phasing

As such, Project 5 would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation to reduce GHG emissions. **(DEIR at 4.7-30)**. In addition to the Project design features listed above, the Project's impacts related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

GHG-1 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.

GHG-2 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not idle more than five minutes in any one hour.

GHG-3 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operations of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.

GHG-4 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.

GHG-5 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.

2.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Potential Effect:

Project 5 would have a significant effect on Hazards and Hazardous Materials if it would: create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment; emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses; be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; for a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires, due to location within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4); expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, due to location within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires due to location within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires due to location within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard; or constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 5 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 5 would not require extensive or ongoing use of hazardous materials. Hazardous materials used during the construction of Project 5 would be typical of most construction projects of this type. Hazardous materials used during construction activities may include gasoline, diesel fuel, oils, lubricants, solvents, detergents, degreasers, paints, and other supplies. All hazardous materials would be transported, stored, and properly disposed of in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. The accidental release of hazardous materials or wastes during construction activities is possible. The accidental release of hazardous materials or wastes would

be promptly contained and abated in accordance with all applicable laws and regulatory requirements, and therefore is not expected to result in a significant impact. **(DEIR at 4.8-11)**. During operation of Project 5, limited quantities of hazardous materials would be stored on-site. These materials would include fire suppressant and transformer insulating oil (mineral oil). The mineral oil would be contained within Project 5 electrical transformers and switches. Project 5 would develop and implement a hazardous materials and hazardous waste management program for both construction and operational phases. The program would include the following, as required by applicable regulations. **(DEIR at 4.8-11)**.

- **Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste Handling:** The construction contractor would prepare a Project-specific hazardous materials management and hazardous waste management program for Project 5. This program would be implemented prior to the start of construction activities. The program would prescribe proper hazardous material use, storage, and disposal requirements, as well as hazardous waste management procedures. The program would identify specific types of hazardous materials to be used during Project 5 construction and operation, and specific types of wastes that will be generated. All personnel would be provided with Project-specific training. These programs would be developed to ensure that all hazardous materials and hazardous wastes would be handled and disposed of in a safe and environmentally sound manner consistent with all applicable laws and regulations. Employees and contractor personnel handling wastes would receive hazardous materials training and be trained in hazardous waste procedures, spill contingencies, waste minimization procedures and treatment, storage, and disposal facility ("TSDF") training in accordance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration ("OSHA") Hazard Communication Standard and 22 CCR. Prior to the start of construction of Project 5, a Hazardous Materials Business Plan ("HMBP") will be prepared and submitted in accordance with Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code and Title 22 CCR, as required by the Certified Unified Program Agency.

- **Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan:** The construction contractor would prepare a site-specific SWPPP for review and approval by the appropriate regulatory agencies and implement it prior to the start of demolition or construction activities at Project 5. The SWPPP would utilize BMPs to address the storage and handling of hazardous materials and sediment runoff during demolition and construction activities.

- **Transport of Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Wastes:** Hazardous materials transported by truck would include fuel (diesel fuel and gasoline) and oils and lubricants for equipment. Transportation of hazardous waste may include hazardous building materials and small amounts of construction waste such as waste oils, solvents, or cleaners. The construction contractor would prepare written procedures for the transport of hazardous materials and hazardous waste in accordance with the California Vehicle Code, California Highway Patrol Regulations (CCR Title 13); Department of Transportation Regulations, Title 49, CFR; and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regulations, Title 40 CFR, and CCR 22 regulations prior to the start of construction activities at Project 5.

- **Fueling and Maintenance of Construction Equipment:** The construction contractor would prepare written procedures for the fueling and maintenance of construction equipment prior to the start of construction activities at Project 5. Vehicles and equipment would be refueled off-site or on-site by refueling trucks. If on-site refueling or maintenance activities are required, refueling and maintenance procedures would include implementation of BMPs to ensure that chemicals do not come in contact with the ground. Equipment will be inspected daily for potential leakage or failures.

- **Emergency Release Response Procedures:** The construction contractor would prepare an Emergency Release Response Plan ("ERRP") detailing the response to releases of hazardous materials. The ERRP would be prepared prior to the start of construction activities at Project 5. The ERRP would prescribe hazardous materials handling procedures for reducing the potential for a release during construction activities, and would include an emergency response program to ensure the rapid and safe cleanup of any accidental spills. All hazardous material spills of threatened release would be immediately reported. All construction and operations personnel would be aware of federal, state, and local emergency response reporting guidelines. Implementation of the aforementioned hazardous materials and hazardous waste management programs would reduce the potential impacts associated with the handling, transport, and use of hazardous materials during both construction and operation of Project 5 to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.8-12)**.

If lead based paint is found during construction of Project 5, the Applicant would comply with County requirements and provide a copy of the qualifications/license of the lead based paint abatement contractor that will perform the abatement or removal of lead based paint to the Department of Public Works Building and Safety Division and the County of Los Angeles Fire Department Health and Hazardous Materials Division. If required by the County, the Applicant would prepare and submit a Hazardous Building Materials Demolition Assessment and Management Plan to the Department of Public Works and Fire Department for review and approval to ensure compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local laws, and regulations. OSHA regulations are in place to assure that these materials are safely removed prior to or during demolition and renovation activities. In compliance with regulations requiring removals by firms and individuals licensed to do such work pursuant to applicable regulations the Project's potential impacts regarding lead exposure would be less than significant. Implementation of the aforementioned ERRP would reduce the potential impacts associated with upset and accidental release conditions at Project 5 (and gen-tie lines) to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.8-13)**.

Project 5 would convert sunlight directly into electrical energy without the creation of hazardous emissions, and no impact to sensitive land uses would occur as a result of hazardous emissions. The primary emissions created by Project 5 (and gen-tie lines) would be air emissions from vehicle and equipment exhaust generated during construction activities. Potential impacts due to air emissions created during construction and maintenance activities at Project 5 would be less than significant, as discussed in Section 4.3 of the DEIR. **(DEIR at 4.8-13)**.

Based on the Environmental Data Review ("EDR"), the location of Project 5 and the Project 5 gen-tie line is not located at a known site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites complied pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No known releases have occurred at Project 5 or adjacent to Project 5. Based on the information compiled in the EDR, Project 5 would have no impact due to site hazards to the public and environment during construction or operations. **(DEIR at 4.8-14)**.

Project 5 is not located within an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public use airport or private airstrip. Therefore, Project 5 would have no impact on public use airports. **(DEIR at 4.8-15, 16)**.

Emergency response and evacuation procedures for Project 5 would be coordinated by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department ("LACSD") and the Los Angeles County Fire Department ("LACFD"). During Project 5 construction activities, the LACSD and LACFD require that adequate vehicular access be provided and maintained. The Traffic Control Plan for Project 5 would provide for the required access of emergency vehicles during construction activities. During operation of Project 5, Project operation staff would work with both the LACSD and the LACFD to ensure adequate emergency procedures are in place. The HMBP would include an Emergency Response Plan. Additionally, an Emergency Action Plan and a Fire Prevention Plan would be prepared for Project 5 as required by Cal/OSHA. These plans would ensure that Project 5 would have established plans and procedures for responding to emergency situations, and would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, Project 5 impacts to emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans would be less than significant during both construction and operations. **(DEIR at 4.8-17)**.

Project 5 is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. No impact would occur in this regard. **(DEIR at 4.8-17)**. A public water system for fire control does not exist near Project 5. The facility design includes a dedicated 10,000-gallon fire water storage tank to be installed and maintained at Project 5, in compliance with LACFD Regulation 19 and other applicable Fire Department water tank specifications. Because the SGF design includes a dedicated fire water tank meeting Fire Department requirements, the water and pressure would meet fire flow needs. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.8-18)**.

Project 5 is surrounded by rural agricultural lands with no industrial uses, manufacturing uses, or other particularly high fire hazard uses in the vicinity. Project 5 would comply with all applicable Fire Code and County and City ordinance requirements, and fire safety standards, as stated in DEIR Section 4.12 Public Safety. A Fire Management Plan, which would be prepared for Project 5, establishes standards and practices that would minimize the risk of fire and, in the event of fire, provide for immediate suppression and notification. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(DEIR at 4.8-18)**.

Project 5 will convert sunlight into electrical energy through a process which would not constitute a fire hazard. All materials and equipment used in the construction of each facility would be specified based on applicable codes and building regulations. Welding activities may also potentially result in the combustion of brush and vegetation. A Fire Protection and

Prevention Plan would reduce these potential impacts to less than significant. A Fire Prevention Plan would be prepared for Project 5 as required by Cal/OSHA, and Project 5 would include a dedicated 10,000- gallon fire water storage tank in compliance with LACFD Regulation 19. Therefore, Project 5 does not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard, and would have a less than significant impact on fire hazards in the area. **(DEIR at 4.8-19)**.

Project 5 impacts related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

HH-1 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Materials Management and Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.

HH-2 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.

HH-5 Construction activities shall be halted if previously unidentified soil contamination is observed or indicated by testing during any earthwork activities. Construction will be halted or redirected until such soil contamination is evaluated and disposed of and/or treated.

2.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Project 5 would have a potentially significant impact on Hydrology and Water Quality if it would: violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; 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; substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; 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; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality; conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52); result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance; use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course); otherwise substantially degrade water

quality; 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, or within a floodway or floodplain; place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain; 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; or place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 5 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

A Notice of Intent form would be submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board ("SWRCB") to apply for coverage under the NPDES General Permit for construction of Project 5. During construction, Project 5 would implement BMPs as specified in the site-specific SWPPP. The SWPPP would be developed by a State of California certified Qualified SWPPP Developer ("QSD") and during construction monitored by a State of California certified Qualified SWPPP Practitioner ("QSP"). The SWPPP would be approved by the County and uploaded to the State via the State SMARTs system prior to Project 5 ground-breaking. The SWPPP would identify construction-phase BMPs to be implemented. With implementation of the BMPs, Project 5 and its associated gen-tie lines would only have the potential to generate less than significant effects on groundwater and/or stormwater runoff, and will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during construction. **(DEIR at 4.9-34; 4.9-38)**.

During Project 5 operations, mechanical equipment on the solar farm would either be made of pollutant free materials or fitted with special containment units to house any possible drips or spills of lubricants, oils, or other chemicals. Maintenance activities, including solar array washing, would be performed with clean water and allowed to evaporate or drip to the ground. Maintenance and operations personnel would be required to maintain all necessary spill prevention, control, and countermeasures on hand during site visits. These spill response kits would include, but are not limited to, personal protective equipment, spill pads, absorbents, booms, shovels, garbage bags, plastic sheeting, and disposal drums. Permanent treatment BMPs would include infiltration basins to preserve water quality. With these spill prevention, control, and countermeasures on-site, there would be a less than significant impact on groundwater and stormwater runoff quality, and Project 5 will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during operation. **(DEIR at 4.9-34; 4.9-38).**

As stated in Section 4.14.5 of the DEIR, water would be required for dust control measures during the duration of construction efforts. An analysis of the water supply, including the use of well water, is presented in DEIR Section 4.14 Utilities and Service Systems. At the outset of construction, water would be supplied via truck to meet the demands of Project 5. Well water is not considered available at this time, and would be reevaluated upon a change in status. The demands of Project 5 are anticipated to have a less than significant impact on the region's groundwater supplies. Furthermore, construction activities are not anticipated to interfere

substantially with groundwater recharge. As stated in Section 4.14.5 of the DEIR, water may be required in the first few years of operation to establish the mature vegetation planted after construction. Similar to the construction period, water would be supplied via truck to Project 5. The volume of water required would be considerably less than the water required for construction activities. Well water would be considered if its availability changes. As with construction, impacts to the region's groundwater supplies are anticipated to be less than significant with operation of Project 5. Also, the effect on groundwater recharge by the development's increase in impervious surface will be mitigated by the proposed infiltration basins. These infiltration basins will allow the increase in runoff volume from the proposed development (up to the 25-year storm event) to infiltrate on-site and recharge the groundwater basin. Therefore, less than significant impacts to groundwater recharge are anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-35)**.

During construction of Project 5 and its associated gen-tie lines, soils would be disturbed through activities such as minor grading and vegetation removal, which could lead to issues with soil erosion and siltation on- and off-site. Through the implementation of construction control measures per California Association of Stormwater Quality Agencies ("CASQA") standards (silt fencing, fiber rolls, and sandbag barriers), Project 5 would have less than significant impacts on erosion and debris deposition during construction (CASQA 2003). Project 5 and its associated gen-tie lines would require minor grading on-site which would not drastically change the existing drainage patterns or natural channels. Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan ("SUSMP")/Low Impact Development ("LID") Reports would help account for the increase in runoff erosion capabilities resulting from the developments' increase in impervious surfaces. The infiltration basins would help reduce flow velocities and the sediment load of the runoff, which would lower the erosion and siltation capabilities of the runoff. Therefore, Project 5 would result in less than significant impacts to erosion and siltation on- and off-site. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Project 5 and its associated gen-tie lines would require minor grading on-site, which would not drastically change the existing drainage patterns or natural channels. The increase in runoff flow rates and volumes from the developments' increase in impervious surfaces would be addressed by Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7. The infiltration basins, created by elevated road sections, would capture the increase in runoff volume (up to the 25-year storm event) and allow it to infiltrate on-site. The remaining runoff would flow over the road section and return to pre-development flow conditions before leaving the project site. With this measure, less than significant impacts would occur related to flooding on- and off-site. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7 would address the increase in runoff flow rates and volumes from the developments' increase in impervious surfaces. The infiltration basins, created by elevated road sections, would capture the increase in runoff volume (up to the 25-year storm event) and allow it to infiltrate on-site. The remaining runoff would flow over the road section and return to predevelopment flow conditions before leaving the Project site. The basins would be placed within the first half of the site to allow flows over the roads sections enough time to normalize before leaving Project 5. Project soils would treat the captured runoff at the infiltration basins.

Therefore, less than significant impacts to existing or planned stormwater drainage systems are anticipated. Also, significant impacts to polluted runoff are not anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Project 5 and its associated gen-tie lines would incorporate Los Angeles County LID standards, while following the requirements of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works ("LACDPW"). Existing on-site drainage patterns and channels would not be significantly altered by the Projects' minimal grading, and all off-site drainage patterns and channels would not be significantly impacted either. Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7 would allow the developments' increase in runoff (up to the 25-year storm event) to be both infiltrated and treated on-site. This also minimizes downstream impacts by returning to predevelopment flow conditions. Therefore, Project 5 will not conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance. **(DEIR at 4.9-38)**.

Project 5 and its associated gen-tie lines are not in the vicinity of any SWRCB-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated. During construction, wastewater treatment systems would not be necessary. The Projects would contract services to supply and maintain portable toilets. Therefore, the impacts of Project 5 to the quality of groundwater and surface water would be less than significant during construction. The same portable toilet services would be contracted for operations. Temporary portable toilet services would be delivered during the required maintenance periods on an as needed basis. As a result, there would be less than significant impacts to the water quality of groundwater and surface water during Project 5 operations. **(DEIR at 4.9-39)**.

Project 5 is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain, and does not involve the construction of housing. Therefore, no housing will be placed within a 100-year flood hazard area, and no impacts are anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-39, 40)**.

Project 5 and its associated gen-tie lines are not within the immediate vicinity of any levees or dams which would place people or structures at risk of significant loss, injury or death in the event of a failure. In the event of a failure of the aqueduct near Project 5, the distance between the site and the aqueduct would allow the flow to dissipate. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated. Project 5 has slopes that very mild, at less than two percent. Therefore, high mudflow conditions are not anticipated. Accordingly, Project 5 will not place structures in an area subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow. **(DEIR at 4.9-40)**.

Project 5 impacts related to Hydrology and Water Quality are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

HYDRO-1 Education and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants and Employees. Appropriate educational materials and training for preventing stormwater pollution and additional BMP Fact Sheets from the California Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks can be found at www.cabmphandbooks.com. Practical information material will be provided to employees on general good housekeeping practices. These materials will describe, but are not limited to, spill prevention and control and the use of chemicals, petroleum products, pesticides

and fertilizers that should be limited to the property, with no discharge of wastes directly or indirectly to gutters, catch basins or the storm drain system. Information will be distributed directly to the employees as well as being posted in public areas. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities. The required materials shall be available at each project site and a log kept to show education has occurred prior to the start of construction.

HYDRO-2 A spill contingency plan will be prepared by the owner/building operator. As a minimum the Spill Contingency Plan will "mandate the stockpiling of cleanup materials, notification of responsible agencies, disposal of cleanup materials and documentation." This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-3 No hazardous materials are anticipated to be stored on-site. If hazardous materials are required to be stored on-site, a designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in accordance with requirements of the Health & Safety Code and store the materials according to applicable regulations. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-4 A designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in compliance with the current requirements of the County of Los Angeles Fire Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-5 Site waste receptacles shall be emptied on a weekly basis or more often to prevent containers from overflowing. Upon inspection any debris or rubbish will be picked up and the site cleaned. The trash area is NOT to be cleaned by hosing down. The type of materials used to clean the area and storage of said materials will be determined by the Contractor. Signage will be posted that lids shall be kept closed at all times. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 at all times during facility operations.

2.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Potential Effect:

Project 5 would have a significant effect related to Land Use and Planning if it would: physically divide an established community; be inconsistent with applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to, the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans; be inconsistent with the zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject properties; or conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria.

Finding:

Project 5 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Land Use and Planning. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 5 is located within a sparsely populated area, and is not located within any established community. The closest established community is Antelope Acres, which is located approximately 1.4 miles north of Project 3, the nearest of the six Project sites. Project 5 is located in an area that has been characterized by agricultural uses for several decades, and has been in transition to residential uses or vacant land. Project 5 would not physically alter the community, would not divide any community, or change any public access routes to them. Impacts would be considered to be less than significant. Likewise, Project 5's proposed gen-tie lines would not result in physical improvements that would result in dividing an established community, and the proposed gen-tie line would be located within a public right-of-way or an easement on private land. Therefore, Project 5 would not divide an established community, and impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.10-36)**.

Project 5 is not located within the boundaries of a Community Standards District; therefore, no district development standards apply to Project 5. The Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan designates the Project 5 site as N-1, Non-Urban use. According to the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, allowable uses in the N-1 designation include utility installations (County of Los Angeles 1986). Project 5 is considered a utility installation, and therefore would be consistent with the N-1 land use designation. As a result, Project 5 would be consistent with the General Plan Land Use designation. Development of Project 5 will be consistent with permissible uses associated with the land use designation and the policies, goals, and objectives outlined in the Los Angeles County General Plan and the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, and will not be inconsistent with any applicable County plan. **(DEIR at 4.10-36)**.

The gen-tie lines for Project 5 are linear infrastructure that would not result in any changes to the existing land use patterns in the area of Project 5. The gen-tie lines would be located underground within Los Angeles County to the extent practicable, and aboveground within the City of Lancaster, either in a public road ROW or on private lands adjacent to the public road ROW. Within the City of Lancaster, the gen-tie line routes would traverse land use designations "NU" Residential and "UR" in the City of Lancaster. According to the County's Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, allowable uses in the N-1 designation include utility installations. Additionally, the City's NU land use designation permits solar generating facilities and utility installations within its designation. In July 2013, the City approved a General Plan Amendment for the UR designation to NU designation for another applicant's solar project that the gen-tie line would traverse to connect to the Antelope Substation. A franchise agreement will be obtained by the Applicant with the City of Lancaster for the gen-tie line that will traverse through this jurisdiction. This agreement will grant a utility franchise and right of way privileges for the proposed gen-tie line. Therefore, no impact to County and City Plans would occur**.** **(DEIR at 4.10-37)**.

The Project 5 site and its associated gen-tie line would not be located within the Fox Airfield's airport influence area ("AIA"). **(DEIR at 4.10-37)**.

The County's CUP entitlement process involves the discretionary review of a project, whereby conditions of approval for Project 5 would be assigned. A CUP Burden of Proof is required to be submitted to determine Project 5's consistency with the General Plan, compatibility with surrounding land uses, conditions to ensure compatibility, land suitability and physical constraints, project design, availability of adequate access, public services and facilities to serve the development, and identify potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures. As shown in DEIR Tables 4.10-1, 4.10-2, and 4.10-3, Project 5 is consistent with County land use designations and compatible with adjacent and surrounding land uses. **(DEIR at 4.10-43)**. The implementation of the environmental mitigation measures and CUP conditions would be expected to minimize Project 5's potential impacts, such that the Project could occur while maintaining zoning compliance within the designated zone. As a result, Project 5 would be consistent with the County's zoning designations. Permitting processes for those portions of the gen-tie lines located in the City of Lancaster would require necessary approvals from the City. Compliance with applicable City zoning regulations and conditions would ensure consistency with City's zoning designations. **(DEIR at 4.10-38)**.

Project 5 and lands adjacent to its associated gen-tie line ROW are located within the County's Heavy Agriculture (A-2) Zone. Project 5 is considered equivalent to an electric generating plant. Under the County zoning code for the A-2 zoning designation (Los Angeles County Code Section 22.24.150), electric generating plants and transmission substations are allowed in the A-2 zones with the issuance of a CUP. Lands adjacent to the gen-tie line for Project 5 would consist of the City's RR 2.5 Zone. The proposed gen-tie lines would be constructed underground within Los Angeles County unless other applicable regulations require above-ground installation and aboveground or underground within the City of Lancaster. The gen-tie lines would be located on private lands adjacent to the public road ROW or within the public road ROW. They are linear facilities that would not result in any changes to the existing land use patterns in the Project 5 area, and would be permitted as part of respective County CUP and City permitting requirements. **(DEIR at 4.10-38)**. As a result, implementation of Project 5 and its associated gen-tie lines would be expected to be consistent with County and City zoning designations, and would result in a less than significant impact relative to the A-2 zoning in Los Angeles County and the RR 2.5 zoning in the City of Lancaster.

As discussed in DEIR Section 4.4 Biological Resources, Project 5 and its associated gen-tie lines are not located within a designated SEA; therefore, SEA conformance criteria do not apply. Project 5 and the area for its associated gen-tie lines contain generally low slopes of 1 to 2 percent gradient, and would not be located within or conflict with designated Hillside Management Areas. Therefore, no impacts would occur. **(DEIR at 4.10-39)**.

Project 5 is located within an Agricultural Opportunity Area, as discussed in Section 4.2 of the DEIR. Project 5 would generate electrical power through renewable solar PV technology which is an allowable use with a CUP. Project 5 would convert land that was formerly used for agricultural production, to renewable energy production. Construction and operation of Project 5 would not involve other restrictions, obstructions, or resources that could result in conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use. Additionally, Project 5 would be located on fallow land that is

currently not irrigated, with surrounding parcels being mostly undeveloped and fallow agricultural land. Project 5 would produce power in a passive manner and would result in minimal air emissions, traffic, and noise, and would not affect adjacent agricultural operations. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(DEIR at 4.10-40)**.

Project 5 contain no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance **(DEIR at 4.10-40)**. Project 5 is not located within a Noise Management Area. **(DEIR at 4.10-41)**.

Project 5 is located within the 500-year floodplain Zone X (Unshaded). These areas are known to be of a very low flood risk. The Project 5 gen-tie lines are located within the 100-year (Zone A) and 500-year (Zone X, Shaded) floodplains. Measures would be taken in the design of the gen-tie lines in order to account for the flood hazards. All of the Project 5 site would be developed, and measures would be taken in the design of the site's solar panels and gen-tie line, to account for the flood hazards. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(DEIR at 4.10-41)**.

2.11 NOISE

Potential Effect:

Project 5 would have a significant Noise impact if it would: result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the project; result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; for a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels; or, for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 5 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Noise.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Construction of Project 5 would take place between the second and fourth quarters of 2014. Sound generated from Project 5 would consist of: (1) short duration sounds resulting from construction activities, and (2) sound during normal facility operations. Vibration from Project 5 would only result during construction. Construction activities would take place only during daytime hours. An evaluation of expected noise and vibration levels was performed, and the ability of Project 5 to comply with applicable noise requirements was assessed.

The Draft EIR determined that the construction noise for Project 5 would be similar to that of Project 1; therefore, the Draft EIR's discussion of Project 5's noise impacts focused on the differences between Project 1 and Project 5, namely received sound levels at the nearest noise sensitive receptor. **(DEIR at 4.11-37)**. These Findings refer to certain facts from the Draft EIR's discussion of Project 1 noise impacts that are also applicable to Project 5.

For Project 5, the following criteria were determined to be inapplicable or to result in no impact:

- Exposure of on-site workers to noise levels that exceed occupational safety standards (90 dBA as a time-weighted 8-hour average or peak noise levels above 115 dBA).

- Exposure of residents to airport or private airstrip-related noise levels above a CNEL of 65 dBA.

Occupational noise exposure is governed by federal and state regulations. Cal/OSHA administers industrial safety regulations in California. Cal/OSHA regulations establish a time-weighted noise exposure limit of 90 dBA averaged over 8 hours (CCR, Title 8, Article 105). Noise source controls, administrative procedures, or worker hearing protection must be provided if worker noise exposure would exceed the 90 dBA limit. The construction contractor selected for the Project would be required to follow Cal/OSHA requirements for construction worker noise exposure. **(DEIR at 4.11-25; 4.11-30)**.

Sound from construction equipment would vary, depending on the construction phase and the number and class of equipment at a location at any given time. Actual received sound levels would fluctuate, depending on the construction activity, equipment type, and separation distances between source and receiver. **(DEIR at 4.11-30)**. Construction noise is a temporary noise source that would only occur during daytime hours. Sound levels from construction are expected to be comparable to sound produced by farm machinery, such as equipment used in nearby agricultural fields. Worst case construction noise levels for the nearest residence would last no more than a few weeks, as construction activities progress across Project 5. Therefore, no one residence would be exposed to significant noise levels for any extended period of time. **(DEIR at 4.11-27)**.

Sound from pile driving would attenuate to 77 dBA at the nearest residence to Project 5, and would attenuate to below 60 dBA within 1 linear mile of this construction activity, depending on meteorological and topographical effects. The average noise level from pile driving is predicted to be 65 dBA, similar to the level resulting at the Project centroid located 1,807 feet from the nearest residence. Because sound levels would be higher than 60 dBA at times, and up to 77 dBA at the closest residence, an exceedance of the County's construction noise level limits is anticipated. Therefore, where pile driving is planned to occur within 3,000 feet of an occupied noise sensitive receptor, an acoustic curtain or sound barrier with a sound transmission class of 19 or greater will be used to reduce received sound levels at the noise sensitive receptors to levels at or below the County's construction noise limit of 60 dBA. Pile driving is expected to last more than 10 days, and a variance from the County of Los Angeles noise ordinance will be required. **(DEIR at 4.11-42)**.

Traffic noise generated during construction of Project 5 on and offsite would temporarily add to overall sound levels. As a general construction practice, functional mufflers would be maintained on all equipment to maintain noise levels as low as reasonably achievable. The Project 5 Applicant would make reasonable efforts to minimize noise resulting from construction activities, as described in Mitigation Measures N1 - N6. In sum, with mitigation measures implemented, including the use of sound curtains or barriers during pile driving, construction sound levels would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.11-27; 4.11-31)**.

The average vibration level generated by Project 5 construction activities will be 0.01 PPV, which would be barely perceptible to humans. Similar to the noise from pile driving, vibration from pile driving would only last for a few weeks at most, and would move throughout the Project rapidly with no single noise sensitive receptor experiencing the peak 0.04 PPV for more than an few hours, which will be perceptible but will not damage structures. Therefore, exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels due to the construction of Project 5 and the gen-tie line will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.11-50)**.

Bohunk's Airpark is located three miles from Project 5. The airpark has very low use levels and no airfield noise contours have been developed. However, due to low operation levels and distance from the airpark, sound levels are assumed to be below 55 dBA CNEL. Project 5 would not create residential land uses, and all Project features are outside the of airfield area of influence. Consequently, there are no impacts from airport-related noise. **(DEIR at 4.11-52)**.

Once operational, Project 5 would generate power using PV modules mounted in rows of parallel racks. The Project is anticipated to be unmanned during normal operation. Systems monitoring would be completed remotely and onsite staff would be limited to repair or cleaning of the PV modules. Maintenance staff would visit two times per year to clean the PV modules, seasonally to clear vegetation, and as needed to perform other general maintenance activities. **(DEIR at 4.11-35)**. Sound sources considered in the operational acoustic analysis include the inverters and transformers associated with the PV modules, the substation, and the transmission line. The principal sources of noise are the cooling-ventilation fans, the electrical components of the inverters and the step-up transformers at the on-site substations. Operational sound sources are all predicted to be less than 35 dBA at nearby noise-sensitive receptors, and would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.11-42 to 4.11-44)**.

Project 5 impacts related to Noise are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

N-1 Construction operations would not occur between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday, or at any time on Sunday with the exception of limited low-noise generating potential night work with Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning and Public Works approval.

N-2 Construction site and access road maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour shall be established and enforced during the construction period.

N-3 Electrically-powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, except for devices like trucks, loaders, dozers, and other heavy equipment.

N-4 Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far as practicable, and no closer than 1,000 feet, from noise-sensitive receptors.

N-5 The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells are prohibited except where required by OSHA or for safety or emergency warning purposes required by other regulatory agencies.

N-6 Project-related public address or music systems used on-site shall not be audible at any adjacent receptor.

N-7 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 which are in compliance with any applicable legally required equipment noise standards. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors) shall be equipped with shrouds and/or other noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment. Mobile sound barriers with a sound transmission class of 19 or greater will be used for pile driving on Projects where received sound levels at the nearest noise sensitive receptor are predicted to be above the County construction noise limit of 60 dBA during the day. With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may need to incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including:

N-8 Siting substations to achieve National Electrical Manufacturers Association ("NEMA") sound ratings at sensitive receptors as described in Section 4.11.5.2 not to be closer to the property line of sensitive receptors than the following distances for each individual project:

- Project 5 – 748 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 82 dBA

N-9 The Applicant shall use NEMA low noise rated transformer equipment which will achieve 10 dBA or greater noise reduction as compared to standard NEMA-rated transformers of a similar size and rated capacity to ensure that Project noise impacts would be less than significant.

2.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

Potential Effect:

Project 5 would have a significant impact on Public Services if it would create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection; sheriff protection; schools; parks; libraries, or other public facilities.

Finding:

Project 5 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Public Services. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 5 is located within the LACFD Battalion 11 service area. Station 112, which is 4.5 miles northeast of Project 5, is the jurisdictional station (i.e. the first-responder) to respond to incidents at the site. Additional fire stations within Battalion 11 (identified in DEIR Table 4.12-1) would also potentially be dispatched to respond to fire protection needs at the site. **(DEIR at 4.12-9)**.

During construction, workers would be temporary and would not be expected to relocate to the Project 5 area, as they would mostly be hired from the available local workforce, and would not be expected to result in significant changes to the local population; therefore, the construction of Project 5 is not anticipated to create significant changes to the local population that would increase the level of demand on fire protection services or that would increase the level of demand on the fire department services such that additional staff would be needed. **(DEIR at 4.12-9)**.

As discussed in DEIR Section 4.13, Transportation and Traffic, construction of Project 5 would not result in significant traffic impacts. However, Project 5 would involve construction of an underground 2.4-mile gen-tie line along 110th Street West and West Avenue J. Transmission line construction would require work in the public road ROW, including limited encroachment into the traveled roadway. It is anticipated that the construction of the Project 5 gen-tie line would only require partial street closures, which provide better emergency access than full street closures. Worksite traffic control plans, permits, and coordination with County departments will be required regarding potential construction impacts to 110th Street West and West Avenue J. Additionally, the LACFD Fire Stations 112, 78, and 140 would be notified at a minimum of three days in advance of any street closures that may affect fire/paramedic responses in the area. In the event that Project 5 would require road closures, alternate route details (detour plans) and the schedule of closures would be submitted to the LACFD prior to construction. Implementation traffic Mitigation Measure TT-3 would minimize potential effects to 110th Street West and West Avenue J such that the impact to LACFD access and response times would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-9)**.

Based on the Applicant's commitment to conformance of construction activities at the Project 5 site and gen-tie line ROW to federal, state, and Los Angeles County ordinances for fire protection, and implementation of mitigation related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials, construction would not be expected to result in significant special fire problems or hazards. Additionally, construction traffic at the site would not be anticipated to have a significant impact on local intersections and road segments. Therefore, Project 5 impacts to LACFD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-9, 10)**.

Operations activities at Project 5 would typically be associated with routine maintenance carried out on-site and along the associated gen-tie ROWs at periodic intervals by a small maintenance crew. These activities would not result in effects to LACFD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection during operations of Project 5; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. In addition, the Applicant would be required to pay taxes as per the Proposition E Special Tax and property tax assessments, which are allocated to the LACFD. These taxes are designed to provide for potential increases in LACFD fire protection service demands to accommodate for new and existing developments. **(DEIR at 4.12-11).**

The Project 5 site is located within the LACSD Field Operations Region 1 service area. The Lancaster Station, which is approximately 11.4 miles east of Project 5, would likely be the first responder to incidents at the site. Currently the station maintains an officer-to-population service ratio of approximately 1 to 1,000. Project 5 does not involve any residential uses, and would not be considered to result in significant increases to population. During construction, workers would be temporary, and would not be expected to relocate to the area as they would mostly be hired from the available local workforce. The employees are planned to be hired from the available local workforce, and would not be expected to result in significant changes to the local population that would increase the level of demand on law enforcement services. **(DEIR at 4.12-13)**.

Sheriff services potentially required at Project 5 would likely include incidents of vandalism or theft. While these incidents would require sheriff services, they are not considered emergency response incidents, and as such would not affect emergency response times. As discussed in DEIR Section 4.13, Transportation and Traffic, construction of Project 5 would not result in significant traffic impacts, and any impacts associated with street closures due to installation of the underground gen-tie lines will be addressed through the use of worksite traffic control plans, permits, and coordination with County departments regarding potential construction impacts to 110th Street West and West Avenue J. Therefore, impacts from the construction of Project 5 to LACSD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for sheriff protection would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-13, 14)**.

Project 5 and its associated gen-tie lines do not include residential development or the influx of long-term workers from outside the area, and accordingly would not generate population growth. Consequently, no new demands on school facilities, parks, library facilities or other public facilities are expected, and no impact would occur to these facilities. **(DEIR at 4.12-15; 4.12-16)**.

2.13 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Potential Effect:

Project 5 would have a significant impact on Transportation and Traffic if it would: conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit; 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; result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks; substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); result in inadequate emergency access; or conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 5 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Transportation and Traffic.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Traffic generated during the construction phase of Project 5 and its gen-tie line would include construction worker commuter trips, water truck trips, and delivery truck trips. Construction worker commuter trips and delivery truck trips are anticipated to arrive to the Project 5 site outside of peak hours. It is anticipated that 30 percent of water trucks would arrive to the Project site during the AM peak hour. Project 5 would have an average of 75 workers per day and a peak of 100 workers per day over a 20-day period during construction. For equipment and materials, Project 5 would have an average of 4 delivery truck trips per day with an expected peak of 26 delivery truck trips. It is anticipated that construction workers and delivery trucks would arrive to the Project 5 site outside of peak hours. **(DEIR at 4.13-35)**.

Dependent upon climatic conditions during construction, the maximum estimated water use for the Project 5 site is 97 acre-feet, which would be obtained from an off-site provider. Potable water would be brought in to the Project 5 site for drinking and domestic needs. During the site preparation and grading activities, water would mainly be used for soil compaction and control of fugitive dust generation. Subsequent to these construction activities, water usage would primarily be used for on-going dust suppression associated with the remaining construction of the Project. Project 5 would require a total of 40 daily water truck trips arriving on-site. Assuming that 30 percent of the water trucks would arrive on-site during the AM peak hour (7:00 AM), 12 water trucks were used in this analysis. As shown in DEIR Tables 4.13-21 and 4.13-22, the local roads would experience a maximum increase in traffic volume of 48 percent

during the AM peak hour. This is mainly due to the existing low volume and low peak traffic conditions for these roads, which are located in rural areas and operate well below the existing capacity of 1,600 vehicles per lane per hour for a 2-lane road. Therefore, it is concluded that these roads have adequate capacity to safely accommodate the increase from water truck traffic and would have a less than significant impact on the existing traffic conditions. **(DEIR at 4.13-36)**.

During construction of gen-tie lines associated with Project 5, it is anticipated that temporary, one-lane road closures would be necessary. A Project Traffic Plan would be prepared to address the temporary one-lane road closures and submitted to the County for approval prior to issuance/approval of the County Grading Permit, as indicated in Mitigation Measure TT-2. Parking, temporary office trailers, and construction and PV equipment lay-down areas would be located entirely within the Project 5 site boundary. The construction traffic impacts would be temporary, and less than significant with mitigation. **(DEIR at 4.13-36)**.

The operational phase of Project 5 is anticipated to only generate an average of 2 additional vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hours on a quarterly or as-needed basis with a maximum of 10 additional trips, which would only occur when panel washing operations are being conducted. Based on the traffic analysis for the water truck trips described above, the operational phase vehicle trips are considered negligible. Therefore, no additional post-construction operational analysis was conducted. The Project would not include any buildings, structures, or other operations that would require a change in the existing air traffic patterns. The Project 5 SGF would be connecting to the existing SCEAS via a 3-mile gen-tie line. Transmission line-related radio frequency interference ("RFI") is one of the indirect effects of transmission line operation. RFI is produced by the physical interactions of the electric fields generated by the transmission line. The level of RFI that occurs usually depends on the magnitude of the electric fields involved and the distance from the transmission line. It is usually associated with transmission lines of 345 kV or greater. The Project 5 transmission lines would connect to the SCEAS with a 69 kV gen-tie line (less than 345 kV) and would not adversely impact RFI effects. The operational phase of Project 5 would have a less than significant impact on the traffic and/or transportation infrastructure. **(DEIR at 4.13-37)**. Project 5 would not conflict with any applicable congestion management programs during the construction or operational phases. **(DEIR at 4.13-39)**.

Air traffic would not be impacted by Project 5. Project 5 would not include any buildings, structures, or other operations that would result in a change in existing air traffic patterns. The PV modules that would be used at the Project 5 site would be non-reflective and would not pose a hazard to air traffic. Gen-tie line components would be below the height limit and would not result in a change in existing air traffic patterns. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.13-39)**.

No existing roads would be altered by Project 5, and Project 5 does not include design features or uses that would substantially increase any hazards. Parking, temporary office trailers, and construction and PV equipment lay-down areas would be located entirely within the Project 5 site boundary. Only temporary one-lane road closures are expected for the construction of the Gen-tie Lines. A Project Traffic Plan would be prepared to address the temporary one-lane road closures and submitted to the County for approval prior to issuance/approval of the Grading

Permit. Therefore, Project 5 would not result in inadequate emergency access. Project 5 is located in rural areas of Los Angeles County and would not significantly decrease the performance or safety of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. **(DEIR at 4.13-40)**.

Project 5 impacts related to Transportation and Traffic are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

TT-1 Prior to issuance of a grading permit, Applicant shall document and submit all required information and/or material pertaining to the pavement conditions of construction routes for the Projects, including the formula for calculation of the Projects' fair share of any repair or reconstruction of construction routes to the satisfaction of LACDPW. Applicant shall reimburse the County of Los Angeles for the cost of any repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes attributable to the Projects as agreed to by LACDPW. The timing of any necessary repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes and the required payment by the Applicant shall be determined by LACDPW.

TT-2 Prior to any construction activities and/or issuance of required encroachment permits from Los Angeles County, the Applicant shall prepare worksite traffic control plans for review and approval from LACDPW and other affected agencies for any closures, partial closures of public streets, or work within or adjacent to the road right-of-way that impacts the movement of traffic. The Plans shall be prepared in accordance with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (2012).

TT-3 Additionally, the County, including LACFD Fire Stations 78 (for R2011-00801) and 130 (for R2011-000798, 00799, 00805,00807, & 00833) shall be notified at least three days in advance of any street closures that may affect fire and/or paramedic responses in the area. The Applicant shall provide alternate route (detour) plans to the County, including three sets to LACFD, with a tentative schedule of planned closures, prior to the beginning of construction.

TT-4 Stagger construction work shifts before or after peak traffic hours.

TT-5 Schedule truck deliveries during off peak hours.

TT-6 Limit water truck deliveries during the AM peak hour to 30 percent of the daily water truck trips. All other trips shall be at off peak hours.

TT-7 Prior to start of construction activities, Applicant shall provide worker education encouraging carpooling and vanpooling by workers and shall provide assistance for organizing vanpools and carpools. A log will be developed to show compliance.

2.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Potential Effect:

Project 5 would have a significant impact on Utilities and Service Systems if it would: exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards; create water or wastewater system capacity problems, 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; create drainage system capacity problems, 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; not have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses; create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; or create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Finding:

Project 5 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Utilities and Service Systems. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The construction of Project 5 and its associated gen-tie lines would generate temporary and limited wastewater as a result of on-site construction workers. The wastewater generated would be collected at the on-site mobile sanitation facilities and then transported to a nearby wastewater disposal facility. In the event that additional wastewater is generated from construction activities, water would be stored in an on-site tank system and would be disposed of at an approved wastewater treatment facility. Construction and operational wastewater will be limited in quantity and significantly below wastewater treatment requirements of Los Angeles County and the RWQCB. **(DEIR at 4.14-14)**.

All wastewater would be treated according to the treatment requirements enforced by the NPDES permit authorized by the Lahonton Regional Water Quality Control Board ("LRWQCB"). Additionally, semi-annual washing of the PV modules would generate minimal wastewater during operation. However, since the wash water would only consist of demineralized water and dust washed off of the modules, it would not need to be treated at a wastewater treatment facility. This wash water would be allowed to infiltrate into the ground and evaporate as it drips off the PV modules. The wastewater generated from maintenance workers would be collected at the on-site temporary mobile sanitation facilities and then transported to a nearby wastewater treatment facility. Project 5 would not exceed the requirements of LRWQCB,

and therefore impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-14)**. Likewise, construction and operation of Project 5 would not exceed the capacity of any treatment plant, and would have no impact to a wastewater system. Consequently, no new wastewater treatment facilities would need to be created and no existing facilities would need to be expanded. The maximum construction water use of Project 5 is 97 acre feet, and the maximum operational water use of Project 5 is 2.9 acre feet per year. No water system capacity problems would be created, and no new water systems or expansion of existing systems would be required. **(DEIR at 4.14-17)**.

Project Site 5 currently drains from southwest to northeast; the post-development condition would maintain this flow path. A SWPPP incorporating BMPs for temporary stormwater management would be prepared and approved before the construction of Project 5 and its gen-tie lines. The final design of Project 5 would allow the pre-development runoff amount to continue to sheet flow in the post-development condition to avoid disturbance to downstream drainage structures or wildlife. The design of Project 5 would eliminate the need for new drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, Project 5 would have a less than significant impact on drainage facilities. **(DEIR at 4.14-18)**.

The construction for Project 5 and the Project 5 gen-tie lines would create a short-term temporary demand for water, primarily in association with dust control. The Applicant would provide a Dust Control Plan to the County prior to the start of construction activities. The plan would detail site-specific dust control measures designed to minimize water use during construction activities, while minimizing fugitive dust emissions. Project 5's maximum construction water use is 97 ac-ft. It is estimated that the Project 5 site would have potentially historically required at least 416 ac-ft of water per year for agriculture. Thus, the maximum construction water use of Project 5 is substantially less than the best estimate of water use of 416 AFY for agriculture, which was historically the primary land use of surrounding land. Based on potential estimated historic groundwater use at the site, there may be adequate groundwater supply within the western portion of the Basin to meet Project 5's construction water needs. In addition, according to the Antelope Valley Integrated Regional Water Management Plan ("IRWMP"), groundwater is considered a reliable water source in the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin. **(DEIR at 4.14-23).**

However, given that the Adjudication will not likely be resolved during construction of Project 5, water for Project 5 would be supplied via truck from either Homer LLC, or the City of Lancaster, both of which have provided "Will Serve" letters indicating their ability to meet the water demands of Project 5. Homer LLC would provide out-of- Basin water stored in the Antelope Valley Water Bank. Potential recycled water providers are Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40, Los Angeles County Sanitation District, and Palmdale Water District. The City of Lancaster has a current supply capacity of approximately 16 million gallons per day of treated wastewater that is suitable for construction use and panel washing. **(Final EIR at p. 256)**.

As previously discussed, the potential estimated historical agricultural water usage for the Project 5 site was determined to be at least 416 AFY. Project 5's maximum construction water use is 97 ac-ft, which equates to 76.7 percent less than the potential estimated historical annual agricultural groundwater usage at the site. Either of the sources noted above would have

sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the Project 5 construction demands from existing water source entitlements and water resources. Therefore the impacts from water usage during construction would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-24)**.

During operations, the maximum water use for Project 5 would be 2.9 AFY, which equates to less than 1 percent of the historical groundwater usage at the site. A maximum of 2.9 AFY of additional water may be needed in the first 2 years of operation to establish the plants for the landscaping buffer. It is unlikely, but possible that additional water (up to 2.9 AFY) may be needed later during the operations phase for supplemental plantings if landscape vegetation expires and has to be replaced. **(DEIR at 4.14-24)**. As with the Project 5 water needs during construction, during operations Homer LLC would also provide out-of-Basin water stored in the Antelope Valley Water Bank. This option would provide a reliable source of water for operations. Potential recycled water providers are Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40, Los Angeles County Sanitation District, and Palmdale Water District. The City of Lancaster has a current supply capacity of approximately 16 million gallons per day of treated wastewater that is suitable for construction use and panel washing. **(Final EIR at p. 256)**. Therefore, the impacts from water usage during operations would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-24)**.

Project 5 and its associated gen-tie lines do not require natural gas or propane during construction or operation; therefore there would be no system capacity problems for those utilities. Since natural gas and propane are not needed for Project 5, no new energy facilities would need to be created, and no existing facilities would need to be expanded. Project 5 may require electricity for the construction equipment and for lighting construction activities. The electricity would likely come from one of the existing SCE lines located on the west and south sides of the site. Electricity consumption during construction would be temporary, and would vary depending on the phase of construction. Overall, the construction of Project 5 would require limited electrical consumption that the existing electrical grid has capacity to serve. Therefore, Project 5 would have a less than significant impact on energy utility system capacity during construction. **(DEIR at 4.14-25)**.

Project 5 would also require electricity for ongoing maintenance operations, lighting, security systems, and other various operational needs. During daylight hours, the electricity needs for Project 5 would be supplied by Project 5's electricity generation. During non-daylight hours, the electricity needs for Project 5 would be provided by either backfeed from the electrical grid, through the proposed gen-tie, or through the existing SCE lines located on the west and south sides of the Project 5 site. Therefore, Project 5 would have a less than significant impact on energy utility system capacity. **(DEIR at 4.14-26)**.

Construction of Project 5 would require minimal ground disturbance during the facility installation. Solid waste generated from construction of Project 5 (and gentie lines) may include paper, wood, glass, plastics from packing material, waste lumber, insulation, scrap metal and concrete, empty non-hazardous containers, and vegetation wastes. In accordance with Title 22 Chapter 22.52, 65 percent of construction and demolition debris would be recycled. Any material that cannot be recycled would be properly disposed of at a regional disposal facility. Any defective or broken solar modules would be returned to the manufacturer for recycling. In

accordance with Title 22 Chapter 20.87, the Applicant would prepare a Recycling and Reuse Plan and progress reports to implement and document the Project's recycling practices. Therefore, Project 5 impacts on landfill and solid waste disposal capacity would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-26)**. Once the SGF is installed, there would be minimal waste generated during Project 5 operations; therefore Project 5 will have a less than significant impact on landfill and solid waste disposal capacity during operations. **(DEIR at 4.14-27)**.

Non-hazardous waste generated during construction, operation, and decommissioning of Project 5 (and gen-tie lines) would be transferred by licensed waste hauling contractors and recycled or disposed of in compliance with local and state regulations. Hazardous wastes would be shipped offsite and treated or disposed in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations for hazardous waste management. The construction contractor would prepare a Project-specific hazardous materials management and hazardous waste management program for Project 5. Project 5 would have no impact relative to compliance with existing federal or state regulations pertaining to solid waste, because Project 5 would be required to comply with all relevant regulations during construction, operation and decommissioning. **(DEIR at 4.14-27)**.

SECTION 3.0 FINDINGS REGARDING CUMULATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH ARE NOT SIGNIFICANT OR WHICH HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

Pursuant to Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines, the following findings and statements of fact identify potentially significant cumulative impacts and Project 5's incremental contribution to the impacts discussed in the Final EIR, in the context of the other five Projects and other cumulative projects. For the following environmental resource areas, Project 5's incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable, and no cumulatively significant impact will occur.

3.1 AESTHETICS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 5), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Aesthetics.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 5, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects. Project 5, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Aesthetics.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Individually, with mitigation, each of the six proposed SGF Projects can each be expected to have a less than significant impact on aesthetic resources. The Project sites comprise 987.1 acres,

or 0.6 percent of the total area within the 5 mile radius. Within the 5-mile radius area, there are 20,909 acres of development listed by individual projects, as shown in DEIR Table 3-7. These development projects, including the Applicant's Projects, comprise 12.6 percent of the area identified in DEIR Figure 3-5 and include solar projects, commercial projects, and residential projects.

From elevated viewpoints, the western Antelope Valley appears as a mosaic of agricultural lands, suburban developments, and open land. From a distance, the proposed SGFs would not appear dissimilar to agricultural fields or existing PV facilities in shape and size. The other solar and real estate developments proposed for the western Antelope Valley would not appear dissimilar to existing land use patterns. From level viewpoints, such as those along local roads, solar or residential/commercial developments would not be prominent unless the observer is directly adjacent to the facility. Because of the flat nature of the Antelope Valley landscape, developments would quickly become less prominent as the viewer travels away from them. In addition, the scenic character on the valley floor is generally low. Existing commercial, residential, and energy developments (including substations, high-voltage transmission lines, distribution lines, and generation facilities) are scattered throughout the valley.

A 12.6 percent level of increase in development within 5 miles of each of the Project sites is not anticipated to be significant from elevated or level viewpoints, because the proposed developments would appear similar to existing developments in the Antelope Valley, and cover only a very small portion of the land within 5 miles of each proposed Project site. Views of open desert lands would still exist, and the flatness of the landscape would limit the prominence of new developments with increasing distance.

The proposed Projects and other proposed projects within the cumulative impacts study area would be individually required to comply with the Los Angeles County General Plan goals and policies, and the Antelope Valley Area Plan policies, as well as applicable ordinances such as the Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance, as they are applicable to aesthetic resources, as identified in Section 4.1.3 of the DEIR. Any cumulative aesthetic impacts would be reduced to a level that is less than significant with mitigation by application of these regulations, and mitigation measures A-1 to A-5. **(DEIR at 4.1-114 to 4.1-115)**.

3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Cumulative impacts to Agriculture and Forestry Resources could occur in the event that Project 5, in conjunction with the six proposed SGF Projects and other cumulative projects results in the area results in a cumulatively significant loss of Important Farmlands or Williamson Act contracted lands.

Finding:

Project 5, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Agriculture and Forestry Resources. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see DEIR Table 3-7). For the purposes of this cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable law ordinances regulations and standards.

Projects 1 – 6 are located in a region with significant agricultural uses. However, the Antelope Valley has been historically and is currently limited by water costs and climate conditions. Cumulatively, the Projects would not develop land classified as Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Project 4 is the only site that currently contains land designated as Prime Farmland and of Statewide Importance. As mentioned above, the DOC is in process of reclassifying Project 4 land currently mapped as Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance to Grazing Land on the 2012 edition of the Important Farmland Map for Los Angeles County. The Projects would not be expected to contribute to the overall trend of conversion of agricultural lands to other uses in the Antelope Valley when considered together with other potential cumulative projects in the area. That said, it is contemplated that at the end of the anticipated 35-year life of Projects 1-6, the associated properties could be returned to agricultural use. The Projects' incremental contribution to cumulative agricultural impacts is considered less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-9)**.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 5), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Air Quality.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 5, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Air Quality. Project 5, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Air Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Twenty-nine related projects have been identified within the proposed Projects' vicinity; locations are listed in DEIR Figure 4.3-2, "Cumulative Projects in the Region". Of these 29 related projects, there are a number of related projects that have not yet been built or are currently under construction. Since the Applicant has no control over the timing or sequencing of the related projects, and the level of emissions that would be generated by the related projects is uncertain, it is infeasible and speculative to prepare a quantitative analysis to ascertain daily

construction emissions that would occur under a worst-case scenario of all 29 related projects being constructed concurrently with the Applicant's six Projects.

For this reason, the AVAQMD was consulted to assess the cumulative impact resulting only from the Applicant's six Projects. The County's EIR consultant (Tetra Tech) met with AVAQMD officials and technical staff at the AVAQMD's office on May 29, 2012, and discussed the proper cumulative Air Quality analysis methodology for the Project pursuant to CEQA. **(DEIR at 4.3-48)**. AVAQMD determined that cumulative impacts from the Applicant's six Projects should be cumulatively quantified based on size, construction equipment per phase, and construction phase duration, and that the related projects should only be qualitatively discussed within the EIR. The cumulative Air Quality analysis was performed based on the direction from AVAQMD, and included the analysis of concurrent construction and operation emissions sources on any one maximum construction day, air dispersion modeling method, and risk assessment method. **(DEIR at 4.3-48)**.

As previously discussed in the analyses above (DEIR Table 4.3-13, "Peak Annual Construction Emissions"; DEIR Table 4.3-20, "Peak Annual Operation Emissions"; and DEIR Table 4.3-22, "Concurrent Health Risk Assessment"), emissions from overlapping construction phases of the Applicant's six projects would not exceed the AVAQMD thresholds on any maximum day or year during construction or operations. **(DEIR 4.3-30; 4.3-49)**.

With respect to the Project's construction-period air quality emissions and cumulative Basin-wide conditions, the AVAQMD has developed strategies to reduce criteria pollutant emissions outlined in the Air Quality Management Plan ("AQMP") pursuant to CAA mandates. As such, Project 5 would comply with AVAQMD Rule 403 requirements, and implement all feasible mitigation measures. In addition, Project 5 would comply with adopted AQMP emissions control measures. Per AVAQMD rules and mandates and the CEQA requirement that significant impacts be mitigated to the extent feasible, these same requirements (i.e., Rule 403 compliance, the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, and compliance with adopted AQMP emissions control measures) would also be imposed on construction projects Basin-wide, which would include each of the related projects mentioned below. **(DEIR 4.3-49)**.

By applying AVAQMD's cumulative air quality impact methodology, implementation of Projects 1 – 6 would not result in an addition of pollutants, such that considerable cumulative impacts in conjunction with related projects in the region would occur. Therefore, the emissions of nonattainment pollutants and precursors generated cumulatively by Projects 1 – 6 would be less than significant. Projects are deemed inconsistent with air quality plans when they result in population and/or employment growth that exceeds growth estimates in the applicable air quality plan. The SGF sites would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, which in this case is the Federal 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan (Western Mojave Desert Nonattainment Area). The Ozone Attainment Plan relies upon future year emission inventories consistent with California Air Resource Board ("CARB") and the adopted General Plan growth projections. As the proposed Projects are not part of an ongoing regulatory program, the AVAQMD recommends Project-specific air quality impacts be used to determine the potential cumulative impacts to regional air quality. As discussed above, peak daily emissions of operation-related pollutants would not exceed AVAQMD significance thresholds.

The combined Projects' emission estimates state that while Projects 1 – 6 would generate air emissions during construction and a minimal amount of GHG emissions during operations, the Projects' incremental contribution, with mitigation, to cumulative air quality impacts do not exceed any air quality significance thresholds and would comply with the applicable AVAQMD AQMP. It should be noted that solar energy provided by the Projects is a much cleaner source of energy than traditional sources used for the generation of electricity, such as the burning of coal, fuel oil, or natural gas. Furthermore, since the percentage of GHG emissions generated by Projects 1 – 6 is so small; Projects 1 – 6 would provide a *de minimis* contribution to significant cumulative impacts caused by other projects in the region (as further discussed in DEIR Section 4.7, Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas). The Projects' emissions of non-attainment pollutants and precursors generated during operations with mitigation would not exceed the AVAQMD Project-level thresholds and are less than significant. As a result, Project-level emissions would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution, such that results in an increase in air pollutant emissions above those assumed in the regional AQMP. **(DEIR at 4.3-52)**.

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 5), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Biological Resources.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 5, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Biological Resources. Project 5, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Biological Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The total area included in the map in DEIR Figure 3-17 showing a 5.0 mile radius outward from each of the Project 1 – 6 solar sites comprises 165,349 acres. Solar development in the area is 8,086 acres (4.9 percent of the 165,349 acres shown in DEIR Figure 3-17). The Silverado Projects cover 987 acres (only 0.6 percent of the total area). Open space and wildlife mitigation lands would be acquired and preserved in perpetuity for Projects 1 – 6. Since the mitigation lands are intended to comprise higher quality wildlife habitat than those impacted by the Projects, impacts will be mitigated. The permanent nature of the land mitigation and preservation program to be implemented would assure that these new wildlife habitat mitigation lands would always be maintained and enhanced for wildlife values. Therefore, cumulative impacts from the Project would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.4-71)**.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 5), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Cultural Resources.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 5, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Cultural Resources. Project 5, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Cultural Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. As described above under impacts specific to Project 5, impacts related to cultural resources would be mitigated to less than significant levels, since the CRHR eligible resources in the area would be avoided. Because impacts to cultural resources would be mitigated to less than significant through avoidance, Projects 1 – 6 would not result in an incremental increase in effects on cultural resources when combined with the other 29 projects. Therefore, no significant cumulative impacts would be expected to occur. **(DEIR at 4.5-35)**.

3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 5), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Geology and Soils.

Finding:

Project 5, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Geology and Soils. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). For the purposes of this

cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time.

It is assumed that construction of all of the cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards, and that geotechnical studies would be performed to assess and mitigate any geotechnical hazards associated with them; therefore, the cumulative projects would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects. It is also assumed that the cumulative projects would comply with all applicable erosion control and stormwater management laws, ordinances, regulations and standards, therefore the construction of the cumulative projects would not contribute to cumulative soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

Proposed Projects 1 – 6 would not expose the public to adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking because the Projects would be contained within a secure fenced area at each location and not open to the public. The potential for injury to workers is also quite low as they will not be on-site the majority of the time, and the likelihood that a seismic event would occur when workers are present is quite small. The Projects would also not result in significant soil erosion because the design and construction of the Projects' facilities would comply with all applicable building codes and standards established by regulatory agencies, including Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the CBC. The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would therefore not contribute incrementally to cumulative impacts resulting from other development within the 5-mile radius. **(DEIR at 4.6-27)**.

3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 5), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 5, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change. Project 5, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15355, a "cumulative impact" is an environmental effect that may result from the combination of two or more environmental effects associated with a proposed project, or from the combination of one or more project environmental effects with related environmental effects caused by other closely related projects. However, in the case of global climate change, the proximity of the Projects to other GHG-generating activities is not directly relevant to the determination of a cumulative impact. Although AB 32 sets statewide targets for future GHG emissions, the scoping plan and other implementing tools of the law are

clear that the reductions are not expected to occur uniformly from all sources or sectors. The conclusions related specifically to Project 5, above, highlights the manner by which the proposed Projects intend to meet many of these strategies.

Numerous options exist for project developers to reduce their contribution to city-, county-, and state-wide GHG emissions, while helping to meet the region's future housing, jobs, and infrastructure needs. However, it is not possible at this time to accurately quantify GHG emissions expected from the related Projects or the GHG reductions anticipated from the above-listed strategies. There is no certain basis for concluding that an emissions increase resulting from the Projects and the related Projects could cause a measurable increase in global GHG emissions sufficient to force global climate change due to the complex physical, chemical and atmospheric mechanisms involved in global climate change.

In addition, the emissions models used for Project-level evaluations do not fully reflect improvements in technology and other reductions in GHG emissions that are likely to occur pursuant to state regulations, such as AB 1493, SB 1368, AB 32, and Executive Order S-3-5, as well as future federal and/or state regulations. Therefore, it is not possible or meaningful to calculate emissions from each of the identified related Projects and compare that with a numeric threshold or reduction target. Projects 1-6 would be consistent with the state's goals in helping the state meet the RPS (DEIR Table 4.7-17), resulting in a GHG emission profile that is below established thresholds, and include implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-1 to GHG-5. Therefore, the Projects do not contribute considerably to cumulatively significant global climate change impacts. **(DEIR at 4.7-31)**.

3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 5), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 5, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Project 5, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see Table 3-7). For the purposes of this cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. It is assumed that for each of the cumulative

projects, Hazardous Materials Management Plans and Hazardous Waste Management Plans would be implemented, a SWPPP would be prepared, and all applicable environmental due diligence would be conducted (i.e., a Phase I ESA). If any of the cumulative projects are within an airport land use plan or airport influence area, the projects would obtain the appropriate authorizations and permitting from the respective Airport Land Use Commission. The cumulative projects would have a less than significant impact with mitigation to hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the land uses in the surrounding areas (primarily agricultural) and the limited amount and type of hazardous materials to be used as part of the proposed Projects 1 – 6, no significant incremental cumulative impacts associated with environmental safety are expected to occur as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed Projects 1 – 6. Regulations implemented by the Department of Toxic Substance Control ("DTSC"), LACSD, LACFD, and Cal/OSHA would require similar measures be applied to other developments in the region. Therefore, Projects 1 – 6 are not expected to result in significant incremental cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. **(DEIR at 4.8-19 to 4.8-20)**.

3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 5), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 5, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Hydrology and Water Quality. Project 5, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Project sites, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-3). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws ordinances regulations and standards. Projects located within 5 miles of the proposed Projects entail the geographic extent under consideration of cumulative impacts. The proposed Projects are six of several proposed renewable development projects that would impact existing and proposed land uses within the general Project area. As shown in DEIR Table 3-7 and DEIR Figure 3-17, the proposed Projects would entail approximately 0.60 percent of all proposed projects within a 5-mile radius.

All cumulative projects that may be approved and implemented would also assess potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality. The proposed Projects 1 – 6 were found to have less than significant impacts related to erosion, flooding, debris deposition, and stormwater quality, with no off-site impacts. Additionally, the proposed Projects would not result in any significant or unavoidable impacts and represent a small fraction of the total amount of lands affected by renewable projects and foreseeable projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects. Therefore, the proposed Projects would not be expected to significantly contribute to potential cumulative impacts associated with other projects in the Projects' region. **(DEIR at 4.9-45)**.

3.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 5), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Land Use and Planning.

Finding:

Project 5, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Land Use and Planning. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6. The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards. **(DEIR at 4.10-43)**.

Projects located within 5 miles of the proposed Projects entail the geographic extent under consideration of cumulative impacts. The proposed Projects are six of several proposed renewable development projects that would impact existing and proposed land uses within the general Project area. Similar potential impacts can result from these projects as from the Projects with respect to consistency with the subject general plan land use plans and policies, impacts to compatibility with surrounding land uses, and regulatory compliance with zoning ordinances. All cumulative projects that may be approved and implemented would also assess potential impacts related to land use and planning. The proposed Projects were found to have less than significant impacts related to compliance with County zoning, consistency with the County General Plan Land Use Plan intent and applicable land use conformance criteria, dividing an existing community, and with no significant impacts to the adjacent City of Lancaster. Additionally, the proposed Projects would not result in any significant or unavoidable land use impacts and represent a small fraction of the total amount of lands affected by renewable projects and foreseeable projects within a 5 mile radius of the Projects. Therefore, the proposed Projects would not be expected to significantly contribute to potential cumulative land use related impacts associated with other projects in the region. **(DEIR at 4.10-44)**.

3.11 NOISE

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 5), have the potential to result in cumulative Noise impacts.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 5, which mitigate or avoid significant Noise impacts. Project 5, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant Noise impact.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Two non-Applicant projects identified have the potential to result in cumulative construction noise impacts, due to the projects being located in relatively close proximity to the proposed Projects, but not close enough to result in vibration impacts. The Western Antelope Dry Ranch project (CUP 11-07) is located approximately 1-mile north of Project 2, and the High Desert LLC (CUP 10-03) project is located approximately 1-mile north of Project 4. These distances are close enough that construction noise could propagate out to distances near the Applicant's Projects, but are not close enough to potentially result in vibration impacts. The time period of construction for these two projects is unknown, but if construction were to overlap with construction of the proposed Projects, there is the potential for increased temporary noise levels at residences; however, none of the noise sensitive receptors that are located in close proximity to Project 4 are also located in close proximity to Antelope Solar 1 or Antelope Solar Farm projects. Therefore, sound levels from construction of the Projects would only be minimally increased (less than 1-2 dBA), or not at all, by simultaneous construction. Therefore, overall cumulative impacts of the proposed Projects 1 – 6 would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures N-1 to N-9. **(DEIR at 4.11-56)**.

3.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 5), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Public Services.

Finding:

Project 5, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Public Services. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Projects amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. It is assumed that for each of the cumulative projects, worksite traffic control plans, permits, and coordination with County departments regarding potential construction impacts would be implemented. **(DEIR at 4.12-16)**.

Projects 1 – 6 would not cause effects to result in significant demands to fire response times. Projects 1 – 6 would be designed with appropriate fire protection considerations, and would also result in less than significant impacts to staffing and response times. Furthermore, Projects 1 – 6 would be required to provide taxes to the County that are designed to address cumulative fire department needs associated with new and existing developments. Other developments in the vicinity of Projects 1 – 6 would also be required to pay taxes and fees to the County to provide for their potential increase to LACFD fire protection service demands (LACFD 2009). Additionally, all development in the area is subject to review and approval by the Fire Department. This ensures that all projects contain appropriate controls to reduce demand on the fire department. As a result, Projects 1 – 6 would be anticipated to result in less than significant incremental contributions to cumulative fire protection impacts. **(DEIR at 4.12-17)**.

Projects 1 – 6 would not cause effects to result in significant demands to sheriff staffing or response times. Projects 1 – 6 would also implement site security control, including 24-hour remotely monitored video cameras for security monitoring to prevent potential theft and vandalism activities. Additionally, a portion of Projects 1 – 6 taxes levied would be allocated to sheriff services. Other developments in the vicinity of Projects 1 – 6 would also be required to pay taxes that would be allocated to sheriff services. As a result, construction and operation of Projects 1 – 6 would be anticipated to result in less than significant incremental contributions to cumulative sheriff protection impacts. Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with sheriff services would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-17)**.

Because development of Projects 1-6 will not induce population growth, no direct or cumulative impacts to schools, parks, libraries or other public facilities will occur. **(DEIR at 4.12-15; 4.12-16)**.

3.13 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 5), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Transportation and Traffic.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 5, which mitigate or avoid significant impacts to Transportation and Traffic. Project 5, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Transportation and Traffic.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Cumulative impacts for transportation and traffic are the combined effect of Projects 1 – 6 with the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects (other projects). This Cumulative Impacts discussion addresses the cumulative impacts of the Applicant's Projects 1 – 6 and the other projects within a geographic radius of 5-mile radius of the Projects (Project Study Area), which could potentially coincide with the expected construction schedule of the Applicant's Projects. Based on evaluation of the Project Study Area and available data from Los Angeles County, there are 29 other projects that have the potential to contribute additional traffic volume within the vicinity of Projects 1-6.

Evaluation of the cumulative impacts within the Project Study Area was focused on the construction-phase traffic for Projects 1-6 and other projects within a 5-mile radius. As previously stated in the individual conclusions for Project 5 above, the operational phase for each Project is anticipated to only generate a maximum of 4 vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hours on a quarterly or as-needed basis with a maximum of 12 additional trips, which would only occur when panel washing operations are being conducted. Based on the traffic analysis contained in the DEIR, the operational phase vehicle trips/traffic for the Projects are considered negligible and would not result in a significant cumulative impact on the traffic and/or transportation infrastructure in the Project Study Area. **(DEIR at 4.13-41 to 4.13-43)**.

3.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 5), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Utilities and Service Systems.

Finding:

Project 5, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Utilities and Service Systems. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same

time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, and regulations. Construction and operation of the cumulative projects would result in less than significant impacts to public facilities, which include electricity, gas, wastewater, and solid waste services. During construction, all cumulative projects would follow required measures to prevent construction interference to utility services, and would comply with recycling requirements to minimize solid waste disposal at solid waste facilities. During operation, the solar and wind generation projects would provide electricity, and would generate minimal amounts of solid waste. During operation, the non-solar/non-wind commercial and residential development projects would generate solid waste as would be expected from these residential and commercial uses; it is assumed that these project proponents have planned for and mitigated for the additional solid waste generation as appropriate.

The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would provide their own electricity for operational needs, no natural gas would be required for their operations, little wastewater (from panel washing) would be generated as part of the operations process, and very little solid waste would be generated. As a result, the total cumulative impacts to utility services would be less than significant, and the incremental contribution of Projects 1 – 6 to cumulative impacts related to utility services would be less than significant. Furthermore, because the Applicant has committed to using out of Basin water during construction and operations, Projects 1 – 6 would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to water supply impacts in the Basin, and would have no significant cumulative effect on water supply. **(DEIR at 4.14-28)**.

SECTION 4.0 FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

These Findings and Statements of Fact regarding project alternatives and certain mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR are set forth to comply with Section 21002 of the Public Resources Code and Sections 15091(a)(3) and 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines. Five alternatives to the proposed Project (consisting of Projects 1-6) described in the Draft EIR were analyzed and considered as follows: 1) No Project Alternative; 2) Lower Intensity Projects; 3) Select Other Project Sites Alternative; 4) Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative; and 5) Wind Energy Generation Alternative. These alternatives constitute a reasonable range of alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. For the reasons set forth below, Alternatives 1-5 are rejected as infeasible for the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations set forth below.

4.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Description:

Under the No Project Alternative, Project sites 1-6 would remain in their present condition with site conditions (i.e., fallow agricultural land) as they currently exist.

Finding:

The No Project Alternative is rejected as infeasible because it fails to meet the Project goals and objectives, and would not contribute to the State’s ability to meet its near- and long-term renewable energy generation goals and objectives.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would not be approved or implemented under the No Project Alternative. The potential environmental impacts and benefits of the proposed Projects would not occur as a direct consequence of implementation under the No Project Alternative. The No Project Alternative would involve taking no action to generate 172 MW of clean, renewable electrical power utilizing solar PV technology and to integrate the electrical output of the Projects into the electrical grid. This alternative would not allow one of the primary purposes of the proposed Projects which is to increase the output of renewable energy in support of the RPS, such that the State of California may meet its current and planned goals for increasing renewable generation at reasonable market rates.

The No Project Alternative assumes that the sites will remain as they currently exist (primarily fallow agricultural land) and no environmental impacts would result. In summary, the No Project Alternative is provided for comparative purposes to the proposed Projects 1 – 6. This alternative is incapable of meeting the stated goals and objectives of the Projects to provide 172 MW of renewable electric energy to utility providers, and does not contribute to the state's ability to meet its near-term and long-term renewable energy generation goals and objectives. **(DEIR 5-1 to 5-2)**.

4.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: LOWER INTENSITY PROJECTS

Description:

Under the Lower Intensity Projects Alternative, fewer than six sites would be developed, and the smaller projects would be developed in a size and configuration that would result in generation of fewer than 172 MW of electricity.

Finding:

The Lower Intensity Projects Alternative is rejected as infeasible because it partially fails to accomplish the goals of the proposed Projects, which are to provide 172 MW of clean, renewable electric energy using solar PV technology, and to deliver the electric output on a wholesale basis to utility providers.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Projects 1-6 are designed to meet the increasing demand for clean, renewable electrical power. Any reduction in the size of the effort results in a similar potential reduction in the reliance on foreign sources of fuel, the diversification of energy portfolios, the contribution to the reduction of GHG emissions, and the generation of "green" jobs. It would also potentially reduce the contribution to the much needed on-peak power to the electrical grid in California.

The opportunity to develop solar power in Los Angeles County has a limited timeframe because the utility companies, which purchase the power, would purchase power from another entity if the proposed Projects are not completed in a timely manner. If Los Angeles County does not

approve the six viable SGFs proposed here, the opportunity to contribute to the competitive solar generation business in the County will be further lost to other projects. The proposed Projects are well-positioned to compete in the industry, are comparatively environmentally superior to most other locations, and have good positions for PPAs and interconnection agreements. Additionally, any reduction of the megawatts produced from these Projects would further limit the County's contribution to the State's renewable energy production goals. These 5 to 52 MW Projects meet the utility industry needs for small projects, and any reduction of the respective Projects' size would jeopardize the success of the Projects. **(DEIR at 5-2)**.

4.3 ALTERNATIVE 3: SELECT OTHER PROJECT SITES ALTERNATIVE

Description:

Under the Select Other Project Sites Alternative, other properties could potentially be used for the six Project sites.

Finding:

The Select Other Project Sites Alternative is rejected, because this alternative would have the same or greater impacts to the environment as Projects 1-6, which can all be mitigated to below a level of significance.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

One key objective for the Project Applicant was to locate the Projects in an area with the following characteristics: (1) adequate solar radiation; (2) close proximity to interconnection locations for each solar site; (3) project sites with landowners who are willing to sell large enough parcels of land for solar generation at market price; (4) lack of threatened and/or endangered biological species on the site; (5) lack of nearby sensitive receptors or land uses to minimize potential conflicts with development (6) relatively flat sites that have previously been disturbed to minimize disturbance to native habitat and to minimize the need for site grading; (7) existing access to accommodate construction workforce needs; and (8) access to nearby workforce to minimize traffic and socioeconomic impacts. The Applicant performed in-depth analyses of over 10,000 acres of land in the Western Antelope Valley, as shown in DEIR Figure 6-1. Of the 10,000 acres screened, only ten percent met the criteria listed above.

The six Project sites selected and proposed by the Applicant are the most viable sites to develop solar electricity generation with minimal environmental impacts. These sites were also chosen for development based on interconnection capacity and requirements placed on the Applicant by the utility providers. Selection of other alternative sites would have the same or greater impacts to the environment since the present Projects are the result of a long and intense effort by the Applicant to find and acquire the most suitable sites according to the criteria given above. **(DEIR at 1-6; 5-3)**. Furthermore, the environmental impacts for Projects 1-6 can all be mitigated to below a level of significance.

4.4 ALTERNATIVE 4: ROOFTOP SOLAR GENERATION

Description:

Under the Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative, solar photovoltaic panels would be installed on private rooftops.

Finding:

The Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative is rejected as infeasible, because the Project Applicant does not have the ability to install solar panels on private rooftops.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

For rooftop solar to be a viable alternative to the proposed Projects it would need to provide 172 MW of electricity into the local grid. Assuming one residential installation can produce 25 kilowatts of electricity, a total of 6,880 residential installations would be needed to produce 172 MW of electricity. The Applicant does not have the ability to install solar panels on private rooftops; therefore this alternative is not feasible for the Applicant. **(DEIR at 5-3)**.

4.5 ALTERNATIVE 5: WIND ENERGY GENERATION

Description:

Under the Wind Energy Generation Alternative, electricity would be generated through the use of wind turbines.

Finding:

The Wind Energy Generation Alternative is rejected as infeasible, because the type of geographical location that is suitable for a wind farm is not available within the vicinity.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

For wind energy generation to be a reasonable alternative to the proposed Projects and meet the purpose and need of the proposed Projects, it would need to provide 172 MW of electricity into the local grid; and to be sited on previously disturbed land that utilizes existing electrical distribution facilities, ROWs, roads, and other existing infrastructure where feasible to minimize the need for new electrical support facilities. The area required for construction and operation of a 172 MW wind farm would require a much more specific type of geographical location than the Projects to provide adequate wind; a feasible project area of the nature required for wind electricity production is not readily available within the area of analysis for the proposed Projects. For this reason, this alternative is infeasible. **(DEIR at 5-3)**.

SECTION 5.0 FINDINDS REGARDING THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM ("MMRP")

Pursuant to Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code, the Commission, in adopting these Findings, also adopts the MMRP for the Silverado Power West Los Angeles Project. This Program is designed to ensure that, during Project implementation, the County and other responsible parties will comply with the mitigation measures adopted in these Findings.

The Commission hereby finds that the MMRP, which is incorporated herein by reference and attached as Exhibit A to these Findings, meets the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 by providing for the implementation and monitoring of Project conditions intended to mitigate potential environmental effects of the Project.

SECTION 6.0 CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15091 AND 15092 FINDINGS

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the administrative record, the Commission has made one or more of the following findings with respect to each of the significant effects of the Project:

A. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects on the environment.

B. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and such changes have been adopted by such other agency, or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the administrative record, and as conditioned by the foregoing:

A. All significant effects on the environment due to the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible.

SECTION 7.0 CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15084(D)(3) AND 15084(D)(4) FINDINGS

The County has relied on Sections 15084(d)(3) of the State CEQA guidelines, which allow acceptance of working drafts prepared by the Applicant, a consultant retained by the Applicant, or any other person. The County has also relied upon Section 15084(d)(4), which allows the Draft EIR to be prepared directly by, or under contract by the lead agency. The County has reviewed and edited as necessary the submitted drafts to reflect the County's own independent judgment, including reliance on County technical personnel from other departments.

SECTION 8.0 PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21082.1(C) FINDINGS

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(c), the Commission hereby finds that the lead agency has independently reviewed and analyzed the Final EIR, and that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency.

SECTION 9.0 NATURE OF FINDINGS

Any finding made by this Commission shall be deemed made, regardless of where it appears in this document. All of the language included in this document constitutes findings by this Commission, whether or not any particular sentence or clause includes a statement to that effect. This Commission intends that these Findings be considered as an integrated whole and, whether or not any part of these Findings fail to cross reference or incorporate by reference any other part of these findings, that any finding required or committed to be made by this Commission with respect to any particular subject matter of the Final EIR, shall be deemed to be made if it appears in any portion of these Findings.

SECTION 10.0 RELIANCE ON RECORD

Each and all of the findings and determinations contained herein are based on the competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire administrative record relating to the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project. The findings and determinations constitute the independent findings and determinations of this Commission in all respects, and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.

SECTION 11.0 RELATIONSHIP OF FINDINGS TO EIR

The County finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the EIR or is in the record of proceedings in the matter.

SECTION 12.0 CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS

The custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the County's decision is based is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning located at 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012.

EXHIBIT A
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
("MMRP")

CEQA requires a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for projects where mitigation measures are a condition of project approval and development. The Draft EIR prepared for the Silverado Power West, Los Angeles County Projects identified mitigation measures, where appropriate, to avoid or substantially reduce the environmental impacts associated with the Project. This MMRP is designed to monitor the implementation of those mitigation measures. Accordingly, this MMRP has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15097.

This section lists each of the proposed Project Design Features (PDFs) and required Mitigation Measures (MMs) and identifies the corresponding action required for proof of compliance, the mitigation timing, the party responsible for implementation, and the monitoring agency or party responsible for ensuring each measure is adequately implemented.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Silverado Power West, Los Angeles County Projects
Project Nos. R2011-00833, 00798, 00799, 00807, 00801, 00805
March 2014

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.1 AESTHETICS				
A-1 A Fugitive Dust Control Plan to minimize dust (visual pollution) shall be prepared and implemented.	A. Submit Plan to AVAQMD for review and approval	Prior to any ground disturbance activities	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP AVAQMD
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD
A-2 The Project site shall be maintained free of debris, trash, and waste during construction.	Site inspection	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP
A-3 The Project site shall be visually screened or partially screened during construction by fencing.	A. Submit Site Plans for review and approval	Prior to issuance of applicable building permit	Applicant	LACDRP
	B. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP
A-4 A landscape plan shall be developed for each Project prior to Project construction that shows the detail of a 10-foot wide screening vegetation buffer intended to screen or partially screen the Project visually from area residents or travelers on nearby roadways.	A. Submit landscape plan for review and approval. The landscape plan must be approved prior to grading or building permit.	Prior to 1st grading or building permit whichever comes first for each project.	Applicant	LACDRP/LACFD – support/referral Approval of landscape plan
	B. Implement approved landscape plan	Prior to first energization approval by LADPW B & S	Applicant	LACDRP/LACFD – support/referral Approval of landscape plan
A-5 All lighting shall comply with applicable provisions of the Los Angeles County Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Lights shall be limited to types allowed by the ordinance, installed below maximum allowed heights, pointed downwards and shielded to minimize light trespass, and mounted on essential infrastructure rather than on separate light poles	Submit final lighting plan for review and approval	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
except where poles are required by regulation or by governing agency. Lighting will comply with the hours of operation requirements in the ordinance, and utilize automatic control devices to comply with time limits except where permitted by Los Angeles County. Lighting will be maintained in good repair at all times.				
5.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY				
No mitigation measures are required for Agriculture and Forestry.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.3 AIR QUALITY				
AQ-1 Water active sites at least twice daily (locations where soil disturbance is to occur would be thoroughly watered before earthmoving) during construction.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVQMD
AQ-2 All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of CVC Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-3 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-4 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not be idle more than five minutes in any one hour.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-5 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operation of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-6 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-7 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.	Submit Transportation Demand Management program for review and approval	Prior to issuance of building permits	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPW support and referral for trip reduction determination

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
AQ-8 During array area preparation, mowing shall be used instead of grading and/or disking, and shall be limited to no more than 3.5 acres per day per site to further reduce dust emissions during construction.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-9 All interior roads shall use long-lasting non-toxic chemical soil stabilizers designed for long-term dust stabilization on dirt roads.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-10 Interior array areas shall have re-established pre-existing vegetation or be established with drought tolerant, native, or native compatible vegetation, to the greatest extent feasible, approved by the County biologist and compliant with Fire Department requirements, within two years of energization authorization of an array area by the Department of Public Works, Building and Safety Division, to provide long-term dust stabilization under the arrays.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Biologist	LACFD LACDRP
AQ-11 Earth disturbing activities shall be suspended and/or additional water shall be applied to meet Rule 403 criteria if wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP AVAQMD
AQ-12 Construction activity shall utilize electricity from power poles on or adjacent to the Project sites rather than use of temporary diesel power generators and/or gasoline power generators when electricity with adequate circuit capacity is available from power poles in proximity to construction areas.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-13 In the event temporary night lighting is necessary for construction or maintenance purposes, lighting not requiring the use of diesel or gasoline driven generators shall be used.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
B-1 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a qualified biologist shall be retained by the Applicant as the lead biological monitor subject to the approval of the LACDRP and CDFW. That person shall ensure that impacts to all biological resources are minimized or avoided, and shall conduct (or supervise) pre-grading field surveys for species that may be avoided, affected, or eliminated as a result of grading or any other site preparation activities. The lead biological monitor shall ensure that all surveys are conducted by qualified personnel (e.g. avian biologists for bird surveys, herpetologists for reptile surveys, etc.) and that they possess	A. Retain qualified Biologist(s)	Prior to issuance of Grading Permit	Applicant/Construction Monitor	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Field Surveys	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Maintain daily monitoring reports	During Construction	Applicant/Construction Monitor	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
all necessary permits and memoranda of understanding with the appropriate agencies for the handling of potentially-occurring special-status species. The lead biological monitor shall also ensure that daily monitoring reports (e.g., survey results, protective actions, results of protective actions, adaptive measures, etc.) are prepared, and shall make these monitoring reports available to DRP and CDFW at their request.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-2 Pre-Construction surveys will be conducted prior to ground disturbance at each project site. These surveys will include all special-status species identified as having the potential to be present on the project site; including, but not limited to, badger, kit fox, southern grasshopper mouse, and the species listed below. • Pre-survey information gathering will include reviewing of all available agency nest data and mapping. • A focused pre-construction Swainson's hawk survey shall be conducted to locate any nesting sites within 5 miles of Projects 1 – 6. If Swainson's hawks or their active nests are located within 500 feet of the project sites, all construction-related work shall be postponed and CDFW will be consulted. • Project-related activities likely to have the potential of disturbing suitable bird nesting habitat, which includes ground nesting birds, shall be prohibited from February 1 through August 31, unless a qualified monitoring biologist conducts nesting bird surveys prior to any construction-related disturbance to confirm the absence of active bird nests or bird nesting habitat. Disturbance shall be defined as any activity that physically removes or damages vegetation or habitat or any action that may cause disruption of nesting behavior such as loud noise from equipment or artificial night lighting. Surveys shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. If an active bird nest is discovered, disturbance within 500 feet for raptors shall be postponed until the nest is vacated, offspring are independent of the nest area and there is no evidence of further attempts at nesting. Limits of avoidance shall be marked with high-visibility flagging or fencing. The Applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures and submit the records to LACDRP and CDFW to document compliance with applicable state and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds. • A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted on each site prior to grading. Pre-construction surveys for burrowing owl shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to	Pre-construction surveys for special-status species that have been identified as having potential to occur on site	Prior to grading or as specified per species	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
the commencement of disturbance. The surveys shall follow the protocols set forth by the California Burrowing Owl Consortium (1993 and 2012). If burrowing owls are found during the pre-construction survey, then replacement burrows and habitat must be provided prior to the commencement of construction. The Applicant shall be prepared to provide artificial replacement burrows in the event that owls are detected, either as wintering or breeding individuals. Wintering individuals may be evicted with the use of exclusion devices followed by a period of seven days to ensure that animals have left their burrows. When it can be assured that owls are no longer using the burrows, the burrows can be hand excavated and collapsed under the supervision of the avian biologist. Breeding owls must not be disturbed and must be allowed to complete the raising of young until the fledglings can forage independently of adults and it can be confirmed that further attempts at nesting shall not be undertaken. When this has been confirmed, the owls can be evicted as described above for wintering animals. • Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for special-status ground-dwelling reptiles, including but not limited to coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard. Surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground 4 to 6 weeks in advance of the survey effort, checking weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles or other species determined important by the qualified biological monitor (i.e., biologist must be appropriately permitted for collection and relocation activities) occurring within the work area prior to the start of work shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.				
B-3 During grading, earthmoving activities, and other construction activities the biological monitor shall be present to inspect and enforce all mitigation requirements and to relocate any species that may come into harm's way to an appropriate offsite location of similar habitat. The biological monitor shall be authorized to stop specific grading or	Biological Monitoring	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
construction activities if violations of mitigation measures or any local, state, or federal laws are suspected. The biological monitor shall file a report of the monitoring activities with LACDRP and CDFW. If ongoing biological monitoring of construction activities reveals the presence of any special-status reptiles within an active work area, then work shall be temporarily halted until the animals can be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones. Work areas shall be surveyed for special-status reptile species, such as the coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard, during construction activities. During the construction, surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground in appropriate work areas and checking them weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles occurring within the work area shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-4 Mitigation lands shall be acquired for Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, special-status migratory and wintering birds, and alkali mariposa lily. <u>Swainson's hawk</u>: Impacts due to development of the projects shall be mitigated by the acquisition of good quality Swainson's hawk habitat targeted within the Antelope Valley. Land shall be purchased or placed in a conservation easement or other suitable deed restriction and managed to maintain suitable habitat in perpetuity. The proposed development is not expected to result in the "take" of Swainson's hawk; however, the Applicant shall be required to consult CDFW in the event of take, which may result in additional mitigation prescribed by CDFW. Although the Projects are not expected to result in "take" of Swainson's hawk, mitigation will still be required to alleviate the effects of cumulative impacts on raptor, migratory bird, and burrowing owl habitats: Replacement land will be provided based on the quality of the mitigation land relative to the impacted habitat. The ratio of such replacement shall be determined as follows: • A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 3 acres of development if the replacement land is superior nesting and foraging habitat contiguous to occupied nesting and foraging habitat, and is within a designated or proposed Significant Ecological Area (SEA). • A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 2 acres of development if the replacement land is unoccupied irrigated land, contiguous to occupied habitat and providing superior quality foraging habitat with trees or other such nesting habitat; • A ratio of 1 acre of replacement land for each acre of development if the replacement land provides similar foraging and nesting habitat. <u>Burrowing Owl</u>: Mitigation for any occupied burrowing owl burrows found during pre-construction surveys will include a comprehensive tiered approach: • Pre-construction and construction monitoring surveys conducted by a qualified biologist to detect potential new owl activity onsite;	A. Acquire mitigation lands for Swainson's Hawk	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Acquire mitigation lands for Burrowing Owl	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Pre-construction survey for Alkali Mariposa Lilies	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	D. If necessary Acquire Alkali Mariposa Mitigation land	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
• Disturbance avoidance of occupied burrows during nesting period February 1 – August 31; • Impact avoidance of occupied burrows; • Burrow exclusion and closure and offsite relocation (>100 m), as described previously in in B-2, will be conducted for unavoidable impacts to occupied burrows (after consultation with CDFW). • Minimizing impacts by protecting in-place any owls, their burrows, and their immediate habitat by establishing setback zones and visual screens for burrows adjacent to construction activity; by placing visible markers, and by conducting construction worker awareness training. Setback widths will be applied as appropriate to the level of existing disturbance and owl stage of activity (e.g., for low to moderate construction-related disturbance activity outside the nesting season near burrows in currently high-traffic or disturbance areas, it is assumed owls are adapted to human disturbance and will not need a large setback). • Mitigating unavoidable impacts to habitat: restore temporary impacts to pre-existing conditions; replace nesting/occupied and satellite burrows lost with the same number of suitable burrows on the mitigation site. Mitigation acreage for foraging habitat provided for Swainson's hawk will be sufficient to replace lost burrowing owl habitat because the hawk's replacement habitat will be in-kind or better (i.e., the Project habitat is low quality overall and mitigation habitat will be at least the same quality as the lost habitat OR will have higher quality habitat features overall, such as increased vegetative structure, higher numbers of prey species, less disturbance, and less potential for predation by domestic animals, etc.). Specific habitat considerations as provided in the CDFW 2012 burrowing owl guidance will be considered in selecting the overall habitat replacement acres for the project. <u>Alkali Mariposa Lily</u>: Alkali mariposa lily will be avoided to the greatest extent possible. If pre-construction surveys reveal individuals that cannot be avoided, mitigation of lost alkali mariposa lily shall be provided at a minimum 1:1 ratio. This acreage will be calculated with input from LACDRP and CDFW. Additionally, because alkali mariposa Lilies have locally available seed sources, plantings of the lilies on				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
appropriate soil types on Projects shall be implemented in selected areas. The lilies may also be transplanted from areas planned for disturbance to more suitable locations in the Project area. Transplantation locations must be situated within adequately buffered areas to be found suitable. For all species the mitigation acreage may be located within the Project sites, but outside of the area of development, subject to LACDRP and CDFW approval, if acreage of sufficient quantity and quality exists.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-5 Review and Approval of Habitat Management Lands Prior to Acquisition: The Applicant shall provide a mitigation land acquisition proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for their approval before acquiring the property. The proposal shall discuss the suitability of the property by comparing it to the selection criteria. As a part of the preparation of the land acquisition proposal, acreage quantification by habitat category will be developed with LACDRP and CDFW based on the following criteria: <u>Habitat Management Land Selection Criteria</u>: The Applicant must identify the region within which lands shall be acquired, and the type and quality of habitat to be acquired. Detailed criteria and acreage for each habitat category will be developed with Los Angeles County and CDFW. Foraging habitat shall be assessed as moderate to good with a capacity to improve in quality and value to Swainson's hawks, and must be within the Antelope Valley Swainson's hawk breeding range. Foraging habitat with suitable nest trees is preferred. <u>Habitat Management Lands Acquisition</u>: Prior to initiating ground-disturbing activities, the Applicant shall provide a proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for off-site mitigation land to be restored, enhanced, or maintained according to the requirements of the biological mitigation measures in this EIR. The proposal will require that mitigation lands identified shall be preserved as open space in perpetuity. Within 45 days of acquiring the mitigation land(s), the Applicant shall record a permanent deed restriction on the mitigation land(s) to be preserved as open space. The deed restriction or conservation easement language shall be submitted to LACDRP and CDFW for review and approval prior to recordation. Alternatively, should a conservation easement on the mitigation land be offered, the permanent conservation easement shall be recorded to the satisfaction of LACDRP and CDFW. The Applicant shall establish a fund sufficient for the restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation land(s) until such time when the mitigation land(s) become self-sustaining and until such time as the mitigation land(s) meet the requirements of this mitigation measure. The fund shall be established within 90 days of mitigation land(s)	A. Obtain approval of habitat management lands	Prior to Acquisition	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Record a permanent deed restriction or conservation easement on mitigation land(s)	Within 45 days of acquiring land(s)	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Establish fund in the amount acceptable to LACDRP and CDFW for restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation lands	Within 90-days of mitigation land(s) acquisition	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
acquisition in an amount acceptable to the LACDRP and CDFW.				
Land Acquisition Schedule and Financial Assurances: The Applicant shall complete acquisition, or execute an irrevocable option to purchase, of proposed Habitat Management lands and shall provide financial assurances for dedicating adequate funding for impact avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, if necessary, prior to the issuance of building permits. If an irrevocable option to purchase is utilized, the applicant shall provide a proposed date of purchase which coincides with construction of the facility.				
B-6 Prior to alteration of any streambeds, the Applicant shall enter into an agreement with the CDFW, pursuant to Sections 1601 through 1603 of the State Fish and Game Code.	Enter into an agreement with CDFW pursuant to sections 1601 through 1603	Prior to alteration of Streambed	Applicant	CDFW
B-7 Within all interior portions of the site within and adjacent to the proposed solar arrays, re-vegetation shall be accomplished (excluding interior roads as follows: Vegetation seeded in these areas shall comprise locally-sourced, native species if available, or, native compatible as approved by the County biologist if sufficient locally-sourced native seed stock not available, approximating low-growing communities such as native perennial or annual grasslands (i.e., wildflower fields). Shrub species shall not be used due to these species inability to survive continued vegetation trimming. Vegetation shall be maintained in accordance with Los Angeles County Fire Department regulations.	Revegetation of interior site, excluding interior roads	After construction	Applicant	LACDRP
5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES				
CUL-1 In the event cultural resources are encountered during construction of the Projects, all ground-disturbing activities within the vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall be notified of the find. The archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American Monirot shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to recordation and excavation of the finds and evaluation and processing of the finds in accordance with § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Potentially significant cultural resources	A. Archaeological monitoring and Native American monitor when there is a find	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP NAHC
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Site inspection as needed	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
consist of, but are not limited to, stone, bone, fossils, wood or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resources are determined to be unique historic resources as defined under § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, Mitigation Measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate Mitigation Measures for significant resources could include but not be limited to avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. No further earthwork shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any archaeological artifacts recovered because of mitigation will be donated to a qualified scientific institution approved by the Lead Agency where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.			Archaeologist	
CUL-2 In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, California State Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 dictates that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to CEQA regulations and PRC § 5097.98. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.	A. Archaeological and Native American monitoring	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist/NAHC representative	LACDRP NAHC
	B. Maintain documentation demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-3 Project 4 construction of gen-tie lines shall maintain the right of way buffer zones prescribed by SCE for this historic electric transmission line resource, which is an active transmission line. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-4 Project construction for Project 4 shall maintain a one acre undisturbed area surrounding the Del Sur Cemetery	A. Submit pre-construction surveys	Prior to construction	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
site. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	B. Construction monitoring by qualified Archaeologist	During construction	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Submit construction monitoring documentation	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	D. Site inspection as needed	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-5 A County approved archaeologist will be retained to initiate and supervise cultural resource monitoring during Project related earthwork in areas of the Project that are within 50 feet from certain significant cultural resources, specifically from the defined perimeter of site CA-LAN-1579H (Project 4). If resources are identified, the procedures outlined in CUL-1 will be followed and/or CUL-2 (as necessary). This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	A. Archaeological monitoring	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
PALEO-1: A qualified paleontologist shall be retained by the Applicant prior to excavations reaching 10 feet in depth or greater. A The paleontologist shall develop and execute a Paleontological Resource Mitigation and Monitoring Program and supervise a paleontological monitor whom shall monitor all ground-disturbing activities associated with such excavations. The Program will outline the procedures to follow in regards to paleontological resources (e.g. monitoring protocols, curation, data recovery of fossils, reporting). If fossils are found during such excavation, the paleontological monitor shall be authorized to halt ground-disturbing activities within 25 feet of the find in order to allow evaluation of the find and determination of appropriate treatment according to the Program.	Paleontological Monitoring	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Paleontologist	LACDRP LAC Natural History Museum support/referral
5.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
No mitigation measures are required for Geology and Soils.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS				
GHG-1 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment	A. Submit operating permit(s) as required	Prior to commencement of construction	Applicant	AVAQMD LACDRP
	B. Maintain log	During construction	Applicant/Construction	AVAQMD

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.	demonstrating compliance		Manager	LACDRP
GHG-2 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not be idle more than five minutes in any one hour.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-3 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have proper training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operations of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-4 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 mph or less.	Site inspection as needed	During construction and grading	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-5 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	Prior to Building Permit	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.8 HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS WASTES				
HH-1 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Materials Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.	Submit Hazardous Materials Management Plan	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC
HH-2 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.	Submit Hazardous Waste Management Plan for each Project	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC
HH-3 Prior to the start of construction activities on the parcel containing the historic UST at the location of Project 1, a Phase I ESA will be completed. This mitigation measure only applies to Project 1.	Phase I ESA	Prior to issuance of grading permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP
HH-4 Prior to the start of construction activities, a closure permit for the UST will be verified or obtained from the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Health Hazardous Materials Division. This mitigation measure only applies to Project 1.	Closure permit or verification for UST – Project 1 site	Prior to issuance of grading permit(s)	Applicant	LACFD
HH-5 Construction activities shall be halted if previously unidentified soil contamination is observed or indicated by testing during any earthwork activities. Construction will be halted or redirected until such soil contamination is evaluated and disposed of and/or treated	Testing of soil contamination	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC LACDRP
5.9 HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY				
Construction				
HYDRO-1 Education and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants and Employees. Appropriate educational materials and training for preventing stormwater pollution and additional BMP Fact Sheets from the California Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks can be found at www.cabmphandbooks.com. Practical information material will be provided to employees on general good housekeeping practices. These materials will describe, but are not limited to, spill prevention and control and the use of chemicals, petroleum products, pesticides and fertilizers that should be limited to the property, with no discharge of wastes directly or indirectly to gutters, catch basins or the storm drain system. Information will be distributed directly to the employees as well as being posted in public areas. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities. The required materials shall be	Maintain log demonstrating compliance of Educational materials and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants, and Employee	During Construction	Applicant	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
available at each project site and a log kept to show education has occurred prior to the start of construction.				
HYDRO-2 A spill contingency plan will be prepared by the owner/building operator. As a minimum the Spill Contingency Plan will "mandate the stockpiling of cleanup materials, notification of responsible agencies, disposal of cleanup materials and documentation." This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Submit spill contingency plan	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACDRP
HYDRO-3 No hazardous materials are anticipated to be stored on-site. If deemed otherwise, a designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in accordance with requirements of the Health & Safety Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction and operations	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACFD
HYDRO-4 A designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in compliance of the current requirements of the County of Los Angeles Fire Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Submit all applicable information	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACFD
Operation				
HYDRO-5 Site waste receptacles shall be emptied on a weekly basis or more often if containers approach overflowing. Upon inspection any debris or rubbish will be picked up and the site cleaned. The trash area/room is NOT to be cleaned by hosing down. The type of materials used to clean the area and storage of said materials will be determined by the Contractor. Signage will be posted that lids shall be kept closed at all times. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 at all times during facility operations.	A. Include waste collection and disposal methods in construction contract specifications	During operation	Applicant	LACSD LACDRP
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During operation	Applicant	LACSD LACDRP
5.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING				
No mitigation measures are required for Land Use and Planning	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.11 NOISE				
N-1 Construction operations would not occur between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday, or at any time on Sunday with the exception of limited low-noise	Maintain log of construction equipment arrivals and exit times demonstrating	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
generating potential night work with Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning and Public Works approval.	compliance			
N-2 Construction site and access road maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour shall be established and enforced during the construction period.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-3 Electrically-powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, except for devices like trucks, loaders, dozers, and other heavy equipment.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-4 Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far as practicable, and no closer than 1,000 feet, from noise-sensitive receptors.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
	B. Inclusion of requirement for a Noise Control Plan	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
N-5 The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells are prohibited except where required by OSHA or for safety or emergency warning purposes required by other regulatory agencies.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-6 Project-related public address or music systems used on-site shall not be audible at any adjacent receptor.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
N-7 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 which are in compliance with any applicable legally required equipment noise standards. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors) shall be equipped with shrouds and/or other noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment. Mobile sound barriers with a sound transmission class of 19 or greater will be used for pile driving on Projects where received sound levels at the nearest NSR are predicted to be above the County construction noise limit of 60 dBA during the day.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
	B. Site inspection as needed	During Construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including: **N-8** Siting substations to achieve NEMA sound ratings at sensitive receptors as described in Section 4.11.5.2 not to be closer to the property line of sensitive receptors than the following distances for each individual project: • Project 1 – 325 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 74 dBA • Project 2 – 1,511 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 81 dBA • Project 3 – 650 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 74 dBA • Project 4 (two transformers) – 1,000 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 77 dBA • Project 5 – 748 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 82 dBA	A. Submit acoustical report demonstrating substation design compliance with applicable noise standards	Prior to issuance of relevant building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer
	B. Construct structures in compliance with noise limit requirements of applicable County codes.	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH
	C. Submit post-construction noise measurements verifying compliance upon request	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support/referral
With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including: **N-9** The Applicant shall choose to use NEMA low noise rated transformer equipment which will achieve 10 dBA or greater noise reduction as compared to standard NEMA-rated transformers of a similar size and rated capacity to ensure that Project noise impacts would be less than significant.	A. Submit acoustical report demonstrating substation design compliance with applicable noise standards	Prior to issuance of relevant building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer
	B. Construct structures in compliance with noise limit requirements of applicable County codes.	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH
	C. Submit post-construction noise measurements verifying compliance upon request	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support/referral
5.12 PUBLIC SERVICES				
No mitigation measures are required for Public Services	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.13 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC				
TT-1 Prior to issuance of first grading or building permit, Applicant shall document and submit all required information	Submit Projects' road survey	Prior to issuance of first grading or building	Applicant	LACDPW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
and/or material pertaining to the pavement conditions of construction routes for the Projects, including the formula for calculation of the Projects' fair share of any repair or reconstruction of construction routes to the satisfaction of LACDPW. Applicant shall reimburse the County of Los Angeles for the cost of any repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes attributable to the Projects as agreed to by LACDPW. The timing of any necessary repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes and the required payment by the Applicant shall be determined by LACDPW.		permit		
TT-2 The County, including LACFD Fire Stations 78 (for R2011-00801) and 130 (for R2011-00798, 00799, 00805,00807, & 00833) shall be notified at least three days in advance of any street closures that may affect fire and/or paramedic responses in the area. The Applicant shall provide alternate route (detour) plans to the County, including three sets to LACFD, with a tentative schedule of planned closures, prior to the beginning of construction.	Provide street closure notifications	Three days prior to any street closures impacting fire and/or paramedics	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACFD
TT-3 Stagger construction work shifts before or after peak traffic hours.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support referral Caltrans
	B. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support referral Caltrans
TT-4 Schedule truck deliveries during off peak hours.	Maintain log of truck arrivals and exit times demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
TT-5 Limit water truck deliveries during the AM peak hour to 30 percent of the daily water truck trips.	Maintain log of truck arrivals and exit times demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
TT-6 Encourage carpooling between construction works.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
5.14 UTILITIES				
No mitigation measures are required for Utilities.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
List of Acronyms: B & S – building and safety BMP – Best Management Practice CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act CASQA – California Association of Stormwater Quality Agencies CBC – California Building Code CDFW – California Department of Fish and Wildlife CUP – Conditional Use Permit CVC – California Vehicle Code dBA – decibels (acoustics) DPR – Department of Parks and Recreation ESA – Environmental Site Assessment hp – Horsepower LACDPW – Los Angeles County Department of Public Works LACFD – Los Angeles County Fire Department mph – miles per hour NEMA – National Electrical Manufacturers Association OSHA – Occupational Safety and Health Administration PRC – Public Resources Code ROW – Right of Way SCE – Southern California Edison SWPPP – Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan UFC – Uniform Fire Code UST – Underground Storage Tank WATCH – Work Area Traffic Control Handbook LACDPH – Los Angeles County Department of Public Health LACSD – Los Angeles County Sanitation District				

FINDINGS OF FACT REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

FOR THE SILVERADO POWER WEST LOS ANGELES COUNTY PROJECT

PROJECT SITE NO. 6 (Lancaster WAD)

COUNTY PROJECT NO. R2011-00805-(5)

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 201100074

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 201100109

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2012061068

PROJECT FINDINGS ORGANIZATION

Section 1	Introduction
Section 2	Findings Regarding Potential Environmental Effects Which Are Not Significant or Which Have Been Mitigated to a Less than Significant Level
Section 3	Findings Regarding Cumulative Environmental Effects Which are Not Significant or Which Have Been Mitigated to a Less Than Significant Level
Section 4	Findings Regarding Project Alternatives
Section 5	Findings Regarding the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Section 6	CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 and 15092 Findings
Section 7	CEQA Guidelines Section 15084(D)(3) and 15084(D)(4) Findings
Section 8	Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(C) Findings
Section 9	Nature of Findings
Section 10	Reliance on Record
Section 11	Relationship of Findings to EIR
Section 12	Custodian of Records
Exhibit A	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP")

SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The County of Los Angeles ("County") Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") hereby certifies and finds that the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County ("Project") Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR"), State Clearinghouse Number 2012061068, has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq., "CEQA") and the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Cal. Code Regs. Sections 15000 et seq., "CEQA Guidelines").

The Project Final EIR consists of the following documents: (1) December 2013 Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR" or "DEIR"); (2) December 2013 Technical Appendices to the Draft EIR; and (3) March 2014 Final EIR.

The Commission hereby further certifies that it received, reviewed and considered the information contained in the following: (i) the Final EIR; (ii) the application for Conditional Use Permit No. 201100074; and (iii) all hearings, and submissions of testimony from County officials and departments, the Applicant (as defined herein), the public, other public agencies, community groups, and organizations.

Concurrently with the adoption of these findings, the Commission adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP"), attached hereto as Exhibit A. Having received, reviewed and considered the foregoing information, as well as any and all information in the administrative record and the record of proceedings, the Commission hereby makes the following Findings of Fact ("Findings") pursuant to and in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15090:

SECTION 1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

1.1.1 Project Location.

The Project site is located in the northern portion of unincorporated Los Angeles County. The EIR analyzed a total of six (6) individual Project sites (collectively, "Projects" or "Projects 1-6"), which will each be subject to separate review and approval by the County.[1]

These Findings specifically pertain to "Project 6", which is approximately 38.5 acres and located at 35th Street West and West Avenue D, in Lancaster, California. The Assessor's Parcel Number ("APN") for Project 6 is 3115-010-004. When complete, Project 6 would produce 5 megawatts ("MW") of electricity from solar photovoltaic modules.

[1] The six individual Projects are not dependent upon each other for success. Each Project can succeed as a stand-alone project if other projects are not approved by Los Angeles County or if technical or financial problems delay or block the completion of a Project. CEQA allows for a group of projects to be analyzed as a single EIR; each Project must also receive approval of its CUP application and other entitlements on the merits of the individual Project and individual site.

1.1.2 Project Description—Features Common to Projects 1 - 6.

There are certain general Project characteristics and features that will apply to each of the individual six Project sites, including Project 6, as follows:

All six of the Projects would be designed and built using the same or similar methods and would have similar Project characteristics. The Projects would utilize photovoltaic ("PV") technology on fixed-tilt or tracker mounting supports. The proposed PV Projects would be constructed in phases and operated for an estimated 35 years. Construction would generally take place during normal daylight hours and would conform to County construction requirements.

Each Project would consist of the following elements:

- PV modules;
- PV module mounting system;
- Balance of system and electrical boxes (e.g., combiner boxes, electrical disconnects);
- Substation (Projects 1 – 5 only);
- Electrical inverters and transformers;
- Electrical AC collection system, including switchgear;
- Data monitoring equipment;
- Generation tie line; and
- Access roads and chain link perimeter security fencing.

<u>Solar PV Generating Facilities</u>

The Solar Generating Facilities ("SGFs") are designed for optimum performance and ease of maintenance. The Projects would consist of a series of PV module arrays mounted on racking systems, which are typically supported by a pile-driven foundation design. The foundation design would be determined based on the full geotechnical survey. The module mounting system, or racking system, would have a fixed-tilt or tracker PV array configuration and would be oriented south to maximize the amount of incident solar radiation absorbed over the course of the year. Electricity from a series of PV arrays would be funneled and combined at combiner boxes located throughout the SGF. The electrical current would then be further collected and combined prior to feeding the inverters. The SGF would be laid out in a PV block design to allow adequate area for maintenance in the way of clearances or access roads.

Inverters would be consolidated in areas to minimize cable routing and trenching and ensure minimal electrical losses. The alternating current ("AC") from the inverters would be routed through an AC collection system and consolidated within system switchgear. The final output from the SGF would be processed through a transformer to match the interconnection voltage. Electrical safety and protection systems would be provided to meet utility, International Organization for Standardization, and regulatory codes and standards. The energy would be

delivered to the regional electrical distribution network. A security perimeter fence with appropriate signage for public protection would be installed. Points of ingress/egress would be accessed by locked gates for facility services and maintenance.

Photovoltaic Modules

The SGFs would require installation of PV modules. The total number of PV modules required would depend on the technology selected, optimization evaluation, and detailed design. The market conditions, economic considerations, and the environmental factors would be taken into account during the detail design process. The following PV module technologies or equivalent are being considered for incorporation into the Projects:

- PV thin-film technology
- PV crystalline silicon technology
- Fixed-tilt configuration; and
- Tracking design configuration.

The modules configured with a fixed tilt would be oriented toward the south and angled at a degree that would optimize solar resource efficiency. For the tracking configuration, the modules would rotate from east to west over the course of the day. Modules would be non-reflective and highly absorptive.

Standard Installation, Array Assembly, and Racking

The final racking system would be determined by optimization evaluations and economic assessments and incorporated into the detailed design. Likewise, the final foundation design would be determined based on the geotechnical survey for each of the PV Project locations. Once the foundation has been installed, the module mounting system would be installed on it. For a tracking configuration, motors would be installed to drive the tracking mechanism. The PV modules would be delivered to each site during construction to support the installation schedule. The module mounting system would be oriented in rows within a PV design block, presenting a standard and uniform appearance across the facility. The panel configuration would be uniform in height and width.

Collection, Inverters, AC Collection, and Transformers

Modules would be electrically connected into strings. Each string would be funneled by electrical conduit (typically underground) wiring to combiner boxes located throughout the solar field power blocks. The output power cables from the combiner boxes would be again consolidated and feed the direct current ("DC") electricity to inverters, which convert the DC to AC. Underground electrical cables would be installed using ordinary trenching techniques, which include excavation of trenches to accommodate conduits. Wire depth and trench backfill would be in accordance with local, state, and federal codes.

The AC energy would be stepped up to the appropriate interconnection voltage by system transformers to match the voltage at the grid interconnection. As required, switchgear cabinetry

would be provided where necessary for circuit control. All electrical inverters, transformers, and gear would be placed on concrete foundation structures.

Commissioning of equipment would include testing, calibration of equipment, and troubleshooting. All electrical equipment, inverters, collector system, and PV array systems would be tested prior to commencement of commercial operations.

Interconnection Descriptions

Each inverter would be fully enclosed and pad mounted and would be approximately 90 inches in height. The AC output of two inverters would be fed via underground cable into the low-voltage side of the inverter step-up transformer, generally within 20 feet of the inverters. Each transformer would be mounted on a concrete pad and enclosed together with switchgear and a junction box. Transformers are typically 87 inches in height. The high-voltage output of the transformer would be combined in series via underground collector cables to the junction box of the nearest transformer, ranging from as little as 60 feet to as much as 700 feet. The collector system cables would be tied throughout the SGF at underground junction boxes to the main underground collector cables, which would be composed of a larger wire gauge, to the location of the generator step-up transformer ("GSU"), as applicable at each Project location. The main collector cables would rise into the low-voltage busbar and protection equipment that would be enclosed together with the GSU. The primary switchgear includes the main circuit breaker and utility metering equipment, and it would be enclosed separately but pad-mounted together with the GSU. Both the GSU and the primary switchgear would stand approximately 87 inches in height.

The output of the switchgear would be the start of the Project generation tie ("gen-tie") line. The connections from the SGFs to the regional transmission lines are made through the construction of gen-tie lines. Los Angeles County requires that all gen-tie lines be underground except when other applicable regulations require otherwise, and Projects 1 − 6 are each designed in this manner. Each gen-tie line would consist of three phases of either underground or overhead conductor and a disconnect switch. The overhead conductor would be mounted on either wooden or tubular steel poles of varying heights ranging from 55 to 85 feet. Pole height would be determined by the span between poles as defined in the final design for each Project.

Data Collection Systems

Each Project would be designed with a comprehensive Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition ("SCADA") system for remote monitoring of facility operation and/or remote control of critical components. Within the site, the fiber optic or other cabling required for the monitoring system, would be installed with the gathering line system throughout the solar field leading to a centrally located (or series of appropriately located) SCADA system cabinets. The external telecommunications connections to the SCADA system cabinets may be through either wireless or hard-wired telecommunications to a centralized data collection center.

The system would also include a permanent meteorological data collection system. The station would have several weather sensors: a pyranometer for measuring solar irradiance, a

thermometer to measure air temperature, a barometric pressure sensor, and two wind sensors to measure speed and direction. These sensors would be connected to a data logger, which would compile the data for transmission to the data collection center.

Construction

Construction for each of the six Project facilities consists of three major phases: (1) site preparation, (2) PV system installation testing and startup, and (3) site cleanup/restoration. Best Management Practices ("BMPs") would be required during all construction phases of the Projects. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP") incorporating BMPs for erosion control would be prepared and approved before the start of construction. The Projects would also comply with applicable post-construction water quality standards adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board ("RWQCB").

PV System Installation

PV system installation includes earthwork, grading, and erosion control, as well as construction of the plant substation and erection of the PV modules, supports, and associated electrical equipment. System installation would begin with teams installing the steel/concrete piers support structures. The exact design would be finalized pending evaluation of soil conditions.

The proposed method of installation would be the use of vibration-driven pile foundations. This step would be followed by panel installation and electrical work. A very limited volume of concrete would be required for the substation footings, foundations, pads for the transformers, and other substation equipment. Silverado Power, LLC ("Applicant") does not propose to use excavated and poured footings or foundations for the PV arrays. Concrete would be produced at an off-site location by a local provider and transported to the Project sites by truck.

The enclosures housing the inverters have a pre-cast concrete base. Final concrete specifications would be determined during detailed design engineering consistent with applicable building codes. The primary site preparation method for the PV modules would be mowing, because the majority of the six sites are very flat with little change in topography. However, there may be a few instances where limited earthwork, including ponding area leveling of less than one foot in depth, and erosion control cultivation may be required to accommodate the placement of PV arrays. Other than required grading for roads, pads, and drainage features, and standard trenching and installation work, no other earthwork would be performed within the array areas. Erosion control techniques used during construction may include the use of silt fencing, straw bales, temporary catch basins, inlet filters, and truck tire muck shakers. Construction of the PV arrays includes the installation of support beams, module rail assemblies, PV modules, inverters, transformers, and buried electrical cables.

Wastes generated during construction may include the following: cardboard, wood pallets, copper wire, scrap steel, common trash, and wood wire spools. The Applicant does not expect to generate hazardous waste during construction. However, field equipment used during construction would contain various hazardous materials such as hydraulic oil, diesel fuel, grease,

lubricants, solvents, adhesives, paints, and other petroleum-based products contained in construction vehicles.

Operations & Maintenance

Upon commissioning, the Projects would enter the operational phase. For the duration of the operational phase, the Projects would be operated and monitored remotely by a third party contractor, with an assumed two on-site visits for security, maintenance, and system monitoring per quarter (total of eight trips per year) by two third party employees in one light duty truck, and two on-site visits by four third party employees for biannual panel washing that includes one light duty truck and one water truck. Therefore the trips would be no more than 10 trips annually for security, maintenance, system monitoring and panel washing. There would be no personnel stationed on-site full time during operations. The PV arrays would produce electricity passively with minimal moving parts; therefore, maintenance requirements would be limited. Any required planned maintenance would be scheduled to avoid peak-load periods, and unplanned maintenance would typically be responded to as needed depending on the event.

Security

To ensure the safety of the public and the facilities, the sites would be fenced and signs would be posted. Security measures would be installed as necessary to mitigate and/or deter unauthorized access. Access to the sites would be controlled and gates would be installed at the roads entering the property.

Decommissioning Plan

A Decommissioning Plan for each of the Projects would be prepared and submitted for approval to Los Angeles County prior to obtaining a grading permit. The plan would assure that the land is protected during operations and returned as closely as possible to its original state upon termination of the use of the land as a SGF. It is unknown at this time if solar energy electricity production would continue to be utilized on this land in excess of 35 years, and thus the future long-term use of the site beyond 35 years is unknown. The life of each facility is presently proposed to be 35 years. The Decommissioning Plan would be implemented in the early summer of the year or year following the time of facility closure thus allowing the site reclamation to be completed outside of the rainy season and before winter begins. In the event that a Project ceases operations prior to completion of the 35-year estimated life of the Project, applicable provisions of the Decommissioning Plan would commence.

Section 1.1.3 Project Description—Features Unique to Project Site 6

Project 6 (Lancaster WAD) would have a generating capacity of 5 MW-AC and would be located on 38.5 acres of primarily unproductive agricultural land in unincorporated northern Los Angeles County. Project 6 would operate year-round, producing electric power during daytime hours.

The power generated by the Project 6 SGF would be connected to SCE's existing 12.47 kV distribution line running east-west along the south side of West Avenue D, with the voltage

transformation equipment and system safety equipment constructed on the site. Project 6 would interconnect via an undergrounded 0.02-mile gen-tie line across West Avenue D originating at the DC collection system within the Project 6 site.

Project 6 Telecommunications Lines

The primary telecommunication method for Project 6 is expected to be direct fiber optic cables placed overhead or underground along the path of the gen-tie line within the public ROW, or located on private land from the Project 6 site to existing or proposed telecommunication infrastructure. A dedicated broadband connection from a local provider will be secured at the Project 6 site.

Project 6 Construction

The proposed Project 6 construction schedule is to begin site preparation and construction in the second quarter of 2014, complete construction within approximately three months, and be commercially operational by the third quarter of 2014. Construction of the site, beginning with site preparation and grading through equipment setup and commencement of commercial operation, is expected to last approximately three months. The on-site workforce would consist of laborers, electricians, supervisory personnel, support personnel, and construction management personnel. Construction would generally occur during daylight hours, Monday through Friday. Construction activities would be conducted consistent with Los Angeles County regulations regarding hours of construction. Project 6 is expected to create 40 new jobs at peak crew size during the construction phase.

The maximum estimated water use for Project 6 is expected to be 24 acre feet, which would be trucked to this site from a private provider of out-of-Basin or other authorized water. Construction water needs would be limited to soil conditioning and dust suppression. Potable water would be brought to the Project 6 site for drinking and domestic needs.

Project 6 Operations

No personnel would be stationed at the facility, and no occupied structures would be built on the site. Full and part-time positions over the life of the Project would be required for periodic operation and maintenance activities, and would be performed by a third-party contractor. Operational water requirements for Project 6 would be 1.0 acre feet per year ("AFY").

Section 1.1.4 Discretionary Actions Required for Project 6

Implementation of Project 6 will require the following discretionary approval action by the County:

- **Conditional Use Permit ("CUP")**: To authorize the construction and operation of a solar photovoltaic electricity generating plant on 39 acres and installation of a water tank in the D-2-2 Zone. The project meets the definition of "electric generating plant" in the Los Angeles County Zoning Code. Pursuant to Section 22.32.090, electric generating plants are a use subject to a conditional use permit in the D-2 Zone.

Section 1.1.5 Statement of Project Objectives

Together, proposed Projects 1 – 6 would meet the existing and future demand for electricity generated from clean, renewable technology by generating 172 MW of electrical energy from the sun. Recent legislation enacted in California recognizes the multiple benefits associated with the development of renewable energy resources. These benefits include a reduced reliance on fossil fuel, diversification of energy portfolios, reductions in greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions, and the creation of "green" jobs within the state of California. Additionally, the Projects would assist California in meeting the newly established Renewable Energy Portfolio Standards ("RPS"). Senate Bill 14 established RPS targets for California, stating: "All retail sellers of electricity shall serve 33 percent of their load with renewable energy by 2020." State government agencies have been directed to take all appropriate actions to implement this target in all regulatory proceedings, including siting, permitting, and procurement for renewable energy power plants and transmission lines.

Each of the six proposed PV Project sites, including Project 6, qualify as eligible renewable energy resources as defined by the California Public Resources Code, and would help the State meet the objective of increasing renewable energy generation. In addition, Projects 1-6 would contribute much-needed competitive energy during peak power periods to the electrical grid in California.

As another key objective, Projects 1-6 have each been sited to minimize impacts to the environment and the local community as follows:

- Using disturbed land or land that has been previously degraded from prior use;
- Using existing electrical distribution facilities, rights-of-way, roads, and other existing infrastructure where feasible to minimize the need for new electrical support facilities; and
- Minimizing impacts to threatened or endangered species or their habitats, wetlands and waters of the United States, cultural resources, and sensitive land uses.

SECTION 1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT PROCESS

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, the County completed an Initial Study (June 13, 2012) for the proposed Project, and determined that an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") was required. A Notice of Preparation ("NOP"), including the Initial Study was circulated to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, responsible, trustee, and interested agencies, and key interest groups beginning June 20, 2012 to solicit comments on the proposed content of the Draft EIR. The NOP was circulated for the required 30-day comment period which ended July 20, 2012. A Scoping Meeting was held on July 14, 2012 at the Lancaster Library located at 601 West Lancaster Boulevard in Lancaster, California, to facilitate public review and comment on the Project.

The Draft EIR includes the Initial Study, the comment letters received during the public review period in response to the NOP, and a transcript of verbal comments received during the Scoping Meeting (see Draft EIR Appendix A-1 to A-5). All NOP comments relating to the EIR were reviewed and the issues raised in those comments were addressed, to the extent feasible, in the Draft EIR.

Potentially significant environmental impacts addressed in the Draft EIR include Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Public Services, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. The Draft EIR analyzed both Project-level and cumulative effects of the Project on these topics and identified a variety of mitigation measures to minimize, reduce, avoid, or compensate for the potential adverse effects of the proposed Project.

The Draft EIR also analyzed five potential alternatives to the proposed Project, including: 1) No Project Alternative; 2) Lower Intensity Projects; 3) Select Other Project Sites; 4) Rooftop Solar Generation; and 5) Wind Energy Generation. Potential environmental impacts of each of these alternatives were discussed at the CEQA-prescribed level of detail and comparisons were made to the proposed Project.

The Initial Study determined that the Project would result in less than significant or no impact to several environmental resource areas:

1) **Mineral Resources**: The Project would not have the potential to result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region, including those identified in a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

2) **Employment, Population & Housing**: The Project would provide significant short-term employment for construction workers during the two year construction period. The duration of construction for the Projects would be less than two years; and construction personnel would commute to the Projects from Lancaster, the Los Angeles areas, and Kern County. However, jobs would be temporary and would be for the two year construction period. Construction workers would not establish new households and are not anticipated to permanently relocate to the area. Additionally, adequate construction personnel presently living in Los Angeles and Kern County would fill all of the jobs that will be available. Area population, housing demands and the need for educational facilities and libraries would not be affected significantly because jobs that would be created are short term in nature; therefore, they would not be impacted by the Projects. Employment, Population, and Housing would not be impacted because the Projects do not require a significant number of personnel to operate them once they are built and producing electricity, and they do not have growth inducing impacts to the local community. Requirements for operations and maintenance are not significant and would be conducted by a few specialized contracted third-party personnel who will cover the Projects. There is no operations and maintenance building on any of the Projects 1-6.

3) **Recreation**: The Project would have no impact on recreation opportunities in the area. There are adequate recreation opportunities in the area, and the availability of these would not change as a result of the Project.

Following the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("LACDRP") internal departmental review and analysis of the proposed Project through the screencheck process, the Draft EIR was submitted to the State Clearinghouse, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, and circulated for public review period beginning January 6, 2014. The 45-day public review period required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15087 ended on February 19, 2014.
A public hearing was held before the County's Hearing Examiner to take public testimony on the Draft EIR, at Lancaster Library located at 601 West Lancaster Boulevard in Lancaster, California, held at 1:00 p.m. on February 1, 2014. Approximately 80 people attended the Hearing Examiner meeting, and 26 attendees provided oral comments on the Draft EIR. A transcript of the oral comments made at the Hearing Examiner Meeting is contained in Section 2.0 of the Final EIR.

SECTION 1.3 PROJECT FINDINGS INTRODUCTION

The Findings made by the County, pursuant to Section 21081 of CEQA, and Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, on the consideration of Project 6 of the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project in unincorporated Los Angeles County, California are presented below. All potentially significant impacts of the Project identified in the Final EIR are included herein, and are organized according to the resources affected.

The Findings in this document are for Project 6 of the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project, and are supported by information and analysis from the Final EIR and other evidence in the administrative record.

For each significant impact, a Finding has been made as to one or more of the following, in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091:

A. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects on the environment.

B. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.

A narrative of supporting facts follows the appropriate Finding. For all of the impacts, one or more of the findings above have been made. The proposed Project will not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts.

SECTION 2.0 FINDINGS REGARDING POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH ARE NOT SIGNIFICANT OR WHICH HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

All Final EIR mitigation measures, as set forth in the MMRP (attached as Exhibit A to these findings) have been incorporated by reference into the conditions of approval for Project 6. These mitigation measures and conditions of approval will result in a substantial mitigation of the effects of Project 6, such that the effects are not significant or have been mitigated to a level of less than significant. Specifically, the Commission has determined, based on the Final EIR, that Project 6 design features, mitigation measures, and conditions of approval will reduce Project impacts concerning Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Public Services, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems to a level of less than significant.

2.1 AESTHETICS

Potential Effect:

Project 6 would have significant visual impacts to the Project area if it had a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; would be visible from, or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail; substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features; or create a new source of substantial light or glare which will adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 6 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Aesthetics.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 6 would be not located along or in proximity to a state scenic highway. The Project 6 SGFs would not substantially damage or impact scenic resources such as trees (including Joshua trees) or rock outcroppings, and there are no historic buildings located in the Project 6 site. **(DEIR at 4.1-105)**.

The existing Project 6 site is currently open land in a rural area, and is typical of the surrounding landscape on the west side of the Antelope Valley Freeway. The visual quality of the site is low. The Project 6 site itself does not have unique or rare features, or hold special significance. The topography is uniform and flat. Vegetation is uniform and consists of desert scrub. No permanent

water features occur on the site, and there are no features or characteristics that set the Project 6 site apart from the surrounding of the desert landscape. **(DEIR at 4.1-111)**.

The Project 6 site is located in the west/central portion of the Antelope Valley, and it is flat with very little variation in topography. The site was previously used for agricultural operations, and is now fallow. Two-track marks are visible from aerial photographs where vehicles have been used onsite. Views of the landscape immediately around the Project 6 site reveal a predominantly flat landscape, and very little topographic variation is visible. **(DEIR at 4.1-61)**.

No riding or hiking trails were identified adjacent to the Project 6 site, and Project 6 would not cause the vacation of any trail. The SGF is not likely to be discernible from hiking trails on Little Buttes, located approximately 6 miles north/northwest of the Project 6 SGF site. The proposed Project 6 SGF would not likely be visible from any of the scenic resource locations identified by the City of Lancaster. The Antelope Valley is extremely flat, which limits the visibility of the Project 6 site unless the viewer is located in a superior position (at an elevation higher from the object/location being viewed). Draft EIR Figures 4.1-29 and 4.1-30 show representative views of the Antelope Valley from elevated locations in the Little Buttes area, Foothills Area, and California Poppy Reserve. These photographs demonstrate how visibility is limited from elevated viewpoints by distance and the flat landscape. Even from a superior viewing position at Little Buttes, a viewer is not likely to be able to distinguish the Project 6 site from a 6- mile distance. If the SGF was discernible from that distance, it would not appear dissimilar to an agricultural field in shape, and would largely fade into the flat landscape. The Project 6 gen-tie line would be undergrounded from the Project 6 site, under the adjacent road, to a riser next to an existing pole. **(DEIR at 4.1-62; 4.1-99; 4.1-104)**.

There are no designated scenic highways in the vicinity of the Project 6 site. The site is located approximately 1 mile east of the intersection of West Avenue D with the Antelope Valley Freeway. Although the Antelope Valley Freeway is not officially designated as a scenic route, it is mentioned in the City of Lancaster MEA as a potential scenic route for its long-range views of the surrounding mountains and close-in views of open desert lands (City of Lancaster 2009a). **(DEIR at 4.1-62)**.

Construction activities at the Project 6 SGF are not likely to be discernible from scenic resources because of the intervening distance. Construction activities are not likely to be noticeable from the Antelope Valley Freeway due to distance. Any visible dust produced during construction would be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of the fugitive dust plan. Any trash, debris, and waste would be removed from the Project site during construction and the site screened or partially screened by fencing as required by Mitigation Measures A-2 and A-3. Construction of Project 6 and its gen-tie line would not significantly degrade views from nearby scenic vistas. **(DEIR at 4.1-99; 4.1-105; 4.1-111)**.

Because construction activities would be limited to daylight hours, impacts from nighttime lighting would not occur. Lighting will comply with the Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance, and impacts would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure A-5. **(DEIR at 4.1-113)**.

Once operational, the Project 6 SGF components may be visible from the Antelope Valley Freeway, particularly from the southbound lanes north of the West Avenue D intersection, approximately 1 mile east of the site. The Antelope Valley Freeway is identified as a potential scenic route by the City of Lancaster's MEA (City of Lancaster 2009a) for its far-off views of surrounding mountain ranges and close-in views of open desert lands. However, because of its low profile, the Project 6 SGF would not obstruct far-off view of surrounding mountain ranges. Because the Project 6 site is separated from the Antelope Valley Freeway by 1 mile of open desert lands, it also would not interrupt the close-up views of the desert. **(DEIR at 4.1-99)**. Even where visible, the Project 6 SGF and gen-tie line would not be a dominant element in views from the Antelope Valley Freeway during or after construction, and from most locations along West Avenue D. As shown in the post-construction visual simulation in DEIR Figure 4.1-38, from 0.25 miles away, the solar modules would form a thin line that mimics the natural horizontal lines of the flat landscape, and would not be a dominant landscape feature. Drivers along the Antelope Valley Freeway would be moving at a high rate of speed, and mostly watching the road. Passengers on the Antelope Valley Freeway would be more likely to notice the SGF, but it would not be in view for longer than a few seconds because of the speed. The Project 6 SGF would be more prominent to drivers and passengers along West Avenue D because observers would be adjacent to the solar field. Drivers and passengers along West Avenue D would be adjacent to the SGF for 0.25 mile for less than 30 seconds if driving at the 55 mile per hour speed limit. Because the flat landscape limits far-off views of the SGF and gen-tie line, Project 6 would not be dominant in the landscape unless the vehicle is directly adjacent to the SGF during or after construction. A 10-foot vegetative buffer is proposed to mitigate views along the southern Project boundary for 0.25 mile where it is adjacent to West Avenue D, as required under Mitigation Measure A-4, which will reduce these visual impacts to less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.1-100)**.

Because of the low height of the solar modules, no significant shadows would be cast upon nearby sensitive land uses. The Project 6 SGF would not create a significant source of light. Light sources associated with the Project 6 SGF would be minimal, and would be restricted to that required for nighttime safety and security according to County requirements, and would comply with all requirements of the Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Only permitted types of lights would be used, and specified height limits employed. Lighting would be installed and directed downward and shielded to avoid light trespass. The amount of light generated by the security lights would be consistent with the provisions of the new Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance, and would allow less light trespass than existing sources of light produced by man-made structures adjacent to the Project 6 site, including residences, roadway lights, and other existing nearby facilities. Motion sensors and time limits would be employed per the lighting ordinance. Project 6 components would introduce minimal amounts of glare to the existing landscape. The PV modules are designed to absorb sunlight, and the glass modules that protect the PV surface are typically formulated to allow sunlight to pass with minimal reflection. Impacts from new sources of light or glare are expected to be less than significant with Mitigation Measure A-5. **(DEIR at 4.1-113)**.

A contrast rating was conducted from the viewpoint shown in Draft EIR Figure 4.1-38 (approximately 0.25 miles east of the Project 6 site) to assess the level of contrast that would be introduced by Project 6 to landform, vegetation, or structures in terms of major landform

characteristics (form, line, color, and texture). The height, bulk, pattern, and scale of the Project 6 features were considerations in the contrast rating process, which concluded that the Project 6 SGF can be expected to introduce a low level of contrast to the landscape from that viewpoint. No changes to landforms or vegetation would be visible. The Project 6 SGF would introduce new structures to the area, but the solar panel structures would be low-profile and the lines created would mimic the naturally flat lines of the foreground landscape. The color of the solar modules, which is dark gray at this distance and perspective, already exists in the landscape. From viewing points further than approximately 0.25 miles from the solar field, at approximately the same elevation, the solar facility would largely fade into the flat landscape and not dominate the view. Even though the SGF components are out-of-character with directly adjacent land (which is primarily rural residential and fallow agriculture), the SGF is not out-of-character when considering the context of the surrounding landscape. Rural development and public infrastructure are common in the landscape around the SGF site, and include an 800-acre water treatment plant, roadways, the Antelope Valley Freeway, communication towers, and rural residences. Wind turbines located at the foot of the Tehachapi Mountains are visible from the Project 6 site as well. Viewers such as nearby residents and travelers on the Antelope Valley Freeway and West Avenue D would still experience views of the open desert lands around the SGF after the facility is constructed (see DEIR Figure 4.1-38). A 10-foot vegetative buffer is proposed to mitigate views directly along the southern Project 6 boundary for 0.25 mile where it is adjacent to West Avenue D. Because other structures including PV solar facilities are common in the vicinity of the Project 6 site and in the larger Project area, and because the Project 6 site itself is not characterized by high visual quality, the visual impact of Project 6 on the existing visual character of the proposed site and its surroundings would be less than significant. The Project would have a less than significant impact with mitigation. **(DEIR at 4.1-112)**.

Project 6's visual impacts are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

A-1 A Fugitive Dust Control Plan to minimize dust (visual pollution) shall be prepared and implemented.

A-2 The Project site shall be maintained free of debris, trash, and waste during construction.

A-3 The Project site shall be visually screened or partially screened during construction by fencing.

A-4 A landscape plan shall be developed for each Project prior to Project construction that shows the detail of a 10-foot wide screening vegetation buffer intended to screen or partially screen the Project visually from area residents or travelers on nearby roadways.

A-5 All lighting shall comply with applicable provisions of the Los Angeles County Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Lights shall be limited to types allowed by the ordinance, installed below maximum allowed heights, pointed downwards and shielded to minimize light trespass, and mounted on essential infrastructure rather than on separate light poles except where poles are required by regulation or by governing agency. Lighting will comply with the hours of operation requirements in the ordinance, and utilize automatic

control devices to comply with time limits except where permitted by Los Angeles County. Lighting will be maintained in good repair at all times.

2.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 6 would have a significant impact on Agriculture and Forestry Resources if it would: convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use; conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract; conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)); result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or 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.

Finding:

Project 6 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Agriculture and Forestry Resources. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

As currently mapped under 2010 data from the Department of Conservation ("DOC") Farmland Monitoring and Mapping Program ("FMMP"), the Project 6 site contains no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. **(DEIR at 4.2-5)**. Project 6 also contains no forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. **(DEIR at 4.2-8)**.

Project 6 is located within the Los Angeles County Zoning Ordinance designation D-2, Desert-Mountain. According to LACDRP, permitted uses of Zone D-2 are identical to permitted uses of Zone A-2 (Chapter 22.32.090). A solar energy generating facility is allowed in Zone A-2 with the issuance of a CUP (Chapter 22.23.150[A]). Project 6 and the Project 6 gen-tie line are not located in an Agricultural Opportunity Area ("AOA"), and are not currently utilized for agricultural purposes. Additionally, the Project 6 property is not under a Williamson Act contract. As a result, construction and operation of Project 6 would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, Project 6 impacts to existing agricultural use zoning, designated AOAs, and Williamson Act contracts will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-8)**.

Project 6 and its associated gen-tie lines will temporarily preclude future agricultural use at the Project 6 site. Following the termination of power generating activities at the Project 6 site, all facilities and equipment would be removed and the land would be restored as near to its pre-

development condition as possible in the event a new similar land use is not contemplated at that time by then current owners. A decommissioning and reclamation plan detailing land restoration activities will be provided, as required by Los Angeles County as part of the CUP. Additionally, the Applicant will be required to provide a decommissioning bond, or other suitable financial guarantee acceptable to the County, equal to the amount of money estimated to be required to decommission the Project, including any additional environmental review which might become necessary, and restore the land to as near its pre-development condition as possible. Project 6 will not impact any land use outside the development site's limits. Impacts regarding the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-9)**.

2.3 AIR QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Project 6 would have a significant impact on Air Quality if it would: conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; cumulatively produce a considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors); expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 6 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Air Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Pursuant to the Clean Air Act ("CAA"), the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District ("AVAQMD") is required to reduce project emissions of criteria pollutants for which the Mojave Desert Air Basin ("MDAB") is in non-attainment. Project 6 is located within a non-attainment area, which means that certain Project-related activities could potentially be subject to emission control strategies contained within the AVAQMD Federal 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan. Construction would involve activities that can result in emissions of particulate matter ("PM"). However, construction of PV panels and the generation-tie line would not require intense earthmoving activities, only the low-impact method of mowing the surface. Compliance with applicable rules, ordinances, plans, and policies would minimize PM emissions during construction. Project 6 construction emissions would not exceed emission thresholds, and would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-29, 30)**. Since construction of Projects 1-6 would occur consecutively over the course of two years, construction of the six Projects could overlap, which may cause a peak in the Projects' daily construction emissions. However, maximum daily and annual construction emissions would not exceed the appropriate AVAQMD significant

thresholds for all pollutants, even with the potential overlap in construction schedules. **(DEIR at 4.3-37)**.

During operation of Project 6, the Project site would undergo maintenance and security activities no more than 10 times annually (as needed), and would not create a daily increase in population or visitors. The assumption of 10 annual trips includes truck trips associated with panel washing. Project 6 would comply with AVAQMD rules and Los Angeles County ordinances, and is designed to be consistent with applicable county policies and the Attainment Plan. Therefore, Project 6 would not conflict with implementing the applicable air quality plan. **(DEIR at 4.3-41)**.

Project 6 emissions estimates are based on compliance with AVAQMD Rule 403 requirements for fugitive dust suppression, watering exposed surfaces two times daily. The short-term emissions during Project 6construction would not exceed AVAQMD significance thresholds. As such, Project 6 would not exceed thresholds, result in violating air quality standards, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. **(DEIR at 4.3-29)**. Likewise, even when all six Projects operate concurrently, the operation of all six Projects would not exceed annual thresholds, violate air quality standards, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. **(DEIR at 4.3-42)**.

Decommissioning of Project 6 (and each of the six Project sites) would require removal of the PV modules, PV module mounting system, electrical boxes, electrical inverters and transformers, electrical AC collection system, switchgear, data monitoring equipment, chain link perimeter security fencing, concrete ballasts, underground vaults, other concrete pads, and transporting all components off site. Air quality emissions from decommissioning would be generated from the pieces of equipment used and any fugitive dust from site preparation activities. Equipment used for decommissioning and removal of concrete ballasts, underground vaults, concrete pads, etc. generally would be similar to that used for construction, except that no mowing or clearing would be required.

Since decommissioning does not involve mowing or clearing activities, the level of fugitive dust emissions would be less than emissions created during construction. After removal of equipment and facilities, the site would need to be re-vegetated. Decommissioning would occur after at least 25 years of operation; therefore, equipment engine technology is likely to be more advanced, and fuels to be cleaner. Criteria pollutant emissions during decommissioning would be equal to or, more likely, less than those estimated from construction for Project 6, and will also be less than significant with mitigation. **(DEIR at 4.3-42)**. Similar to criteria pollutant emissions, hazardous air pollutant emissions during decommissioning would be less than during construction due to advanced equipment engine technology and cleaner fuel and would therefore be less than significant. Exhaust from off-road equipment and on-road vehicles used during decommissioning and construction truck trips would not be expected to create objectionable odors, and would therefore be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-42).**

The MDAB is currently nonattainment for federal and state ozone standards and nonattainment for state PM_{10} standards, which may cause emissions from Project 6 to contribute to an existing or projected air quality standard exceedance. Implementing any of the six Projects (including Project 6) would increase short-term emissions related to construction, and a negligible increase in long-term emissions related to SGF operation and maintenance. Construction for all six sites is

expected to be staggered, and may extend over two years. Nevertheless, due to the nature and size of each site, simultaneous construction would not result in emissions of ozone precursors or PM_{10} that exceed daily thresholds. As shown in DEIR Table 4.3-12, "Mitigated Peak Daily Concurrent Construction Emissions", and DEIR Table 4.3-13, "Peak Annual Concurrent Construction Emissions", the impacts would be less than significant prior to mitigation. Implementing control strategies to reduce PM_{10} further minimizes air emissions. As such, construction of Project 6 would not 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). **(DEIR at 4.3-43)**.

During the operation phase, Project 6 will have no major emissions sources. Facility operating equipment that emits regulated air pollutants or requires AVAQMD permits is not planned at Project 6 or any of the six Project sites. As shown in DEIR Table 4.3-20, "Peak Annual Concurrent Operation Emissions", the impacts would be less than significant. As such, operation of Project 6 would not 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). **(DEIR at 4.3-43)**.

Project 6 was analyzed for air impacts to nearby sensitive receptors; however, sensitive receptors would only be exposed during construction activities. PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations are expected to occur primarily from fugitive dust emissions during mowing, excavation activities and, to a lesser degree, during PV installation and paving. Rule 401 requires that airborne particles remain on the site from which they originate under normal wind conditions. Proper mitigation techniques must be implemented to ensure that fugitive dust is contained. Emissions are not expected to expose even the closest sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and, due to the distance between Project sites, simultaneous construction at two sites would not significantly impact the same sensitive receptors. **(DEIR at 4.3-44)**.

Operational emissions from Project 6 would not impact local air pollutant levels at nearby receptors. As mentioned above, sensitive receptors would only be exposed, if at all, during construction activities. The primary source of Project emissions during operation is the vehicles used by facility maintenance staff traveling to and from the site. Maintenance is expected to occur no more than 10 times per year. Overall, Project 6 would not result in an increase in VMT over the course of one summer or winter day. Thus, Project 6 would not result in new long-term stationary sources, nor would they result in a significant number of net new vehicular trips. Carbon monoxide (CO) impacts from operation of Project 6 to sensitive receptors would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.3-44)**.

Short-term concentration levels during the construction phase will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, including those resulting in a cancer risk greater than the EPA screening levels. **(DEIR at 4.3-45)**. Due to continuous construction of each of the six Project sites over the course of two years (which may overlap), long-term cancer impacts from construction activities to the nearest sensitive receptors were evaluated, and found that even with the cumulative contribution of health risk impacts from all six proposed Projects, the cumulative cancer risk to the identified sensitive receptors is still below the cancer risk exposure level.

(DEIR at 4.3-46). Short-term concentration levels during Project 6 site construction will neither expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, nor exceed the cancer risk screening levels. **(DEIR at 4.3-47)**.

Project 6's Air Quality impacts are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

AQ-1 Water active sites at least twice daily (locations where soil disturbance is to occur would be thoroughly watered before earthmoving) during construction, or, in locations where water alone does not suffice to suppress dust adequately apply nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers, according to manufacturers' specifications. Temporarily stockpiled soil shall be secured with tarps or plastic sheeting or sprayed with non-toxic soil stabilizers.

AQ-2 All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).

AQ-3 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.

AQ-4 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not idle more than five minutes in any one hour.

AQ-5 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operation of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.

AQ-6 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.

AQ-7 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.

AQ-8 During array area preparation, mowing shall be used instead of grading and/or disking, and shall be limited to no more than 3.5 acres per day per site to further reduce dust emissions during construction.

AQ-9 All interior roads shall use long-lasting non-toxic chemical soil stabilizers designed for long-term dust stabilization on dirt roads.

AQ-10 Interior array areas shall have re-established pre-existing vegetation or be established with drought tolerant, native, or native compatible vegetation approved by the County biologist and compliant with Fire Department requirements, within two years of energization authorization of an array area by the Department of Public Works, Building and Safety Division, to provide long-term dust stabilization under the arrays.

AQ-11 Earth disturbing activities shall be suspended and/or additional water shall be applied to meet Rule 403 criteria if wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour.

AQ-12 Construction activity shall utilize electricity from power poles on or adjacent to the Project sites rather than use of temporary diesel power generators and/or gasoline power generators when electricity with adequate circuit capacity is available from power poles in proximity to construction areas.

AQ-13 In the event temporary night lighting is necessary for construction or maintenance purposes, lighting not requiring the use of diesel or gasoline driven generators shall be used.

2.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 6 would have a significant impact on biological resources if it would: 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 Wildlife ("CDFW") or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ("USFWS"); have a substantial adverse effect on sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations of CDFW or USFWS; have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including marshes, vernal pools, and coastal wetlands) or waters of the United States, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; 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; convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, southern California black walnut, etc.); conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas ("SEAs") (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Section 22.56.215), and the Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas ("SERAs"), (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Section 22.44, Part 6); or conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 6 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Biological Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 6 does not contain riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, wetlands, Joshua trees, or yucca trees on the site, and does not contain non-jurisdictional or state regulated waters. **(DEIR at 4.4-59)**. There are no wetlands, vernal pools, or riparian habitat identified on the Project 6 site. No federally protected wetlands (including marshes, vernal pools, and coastal wetlands) or waters of the United States, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act features, were identified on the Project 6 site. There is a man-made agricultural irrigation canal and detention basin on the Project 6 site, but these features do not support riparian vegetation or riparian habitats. **(DEIR at 4.4-61)**.

Project 6 does not contain oak trees, juniper trees, Joshua trees, or other unique native trees. **(DEIR at 4.4-62)**. Project 6 and the immediate vicinity do not contain or conflict with any Significant Ecological Areas ("SEAs"), Wildflower Reserve Areas, or Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas ("SERAs"). The closest SEA to Project 6 is Rosamond Lake SEA, 3 miles to the east. Therefore, Project 6 would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. **(DEIR at 4.4-64)**. There are no adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plans in effect within the boundaries of the Project 6 site. **(DEIR at 4.4-64)**.

Several special status plants have potential to occur or occurred on the Project 6 site. Spreading pygmyleaf has a moderate potential to occur, and the alkali mariposa lily has a high potential to occur on Project 6. The Mojave spineflower is a special status plant species that was observed during the Project 6 site visit. This species was present throughout multiple portions of the western half of Project 6. The Project 6 site has low potential for the following species to occur onsite: Bell's sage sparrow, coast horned lizard, Cooper's hawk, ferruginous hawk, least Bell's vireo, Le Conte's thrasher, Mohave ground squirrel, mountain plover, American badger, southern grasshopper mouse, white-faced ibis, and Swainson's hawk. **(DEIR at 4.4-59)**.

There is moderate potential for the burrowing owl to occur on the Project 6 site, and high potential for the loggerhead shrike to occur onsite. Developing the site as a solar generating facility would remove habitat for these species, which is a potentially significant impact as the 38.5 acres of land for Project 6 would be mostly unavailable as wildlife habitat during the life of Project 6. However, this impact is less than significant with mitigation. **(DEIR at 4.4-59)**.

Project 6 is within an area of topographically homogeneous open space, and there are no local constraints to movement of resident or migratory wildlife that development of Project 6 would further aggravate. There are no known wildlife migration pathways that would be impacted by Project 6. Wildlife nursery areas on the Project 6 site may include nesting sites of native bird species, which are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-712; Ch. 128; July 13, 1918; 40 Stat. 755) and the California Fish and Game Code Section 3503. Burrowing owls may have suitable burrows on the Project 6 site, and protections for bird nesting

and burrowing owls are provided in mitigation measures B-1, B-2, B-3 and B-4. The intent of acquiring mitigation lands would be to select available parcels that would replace lost breeding/foraging/winter foraging habitat and enhance the overall quality of habitat for a variety of species including migratory bird species. The potential to acquire parcels that would also maintain or enhance wildlife migration corridors in the area would also be considered. Planting of shrubs and native vegetation on the Project site would improve the opportunities for shrub-nesting bird species on the Project 6 site when it is complete. **(DEIR at 4.4-61)**.

Project 6 impacts to Biological Resources are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

B-1: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a qualified biologist shall be retained by the Applicant as the lead biological monitor subject to the approval of the LACDRP and CDFW. That person shall ensure that impacts to all biological resources are minimized or avoided, and shall conduct (or supervise) pre-grading field surveys for species that may be avoided, affected, or eliminated as a result of grading or any other site preparation activities. The lead biological monitor shall ensure that all surveys are conducted by qualified personnel (e.g. avian biologists for bird surveys, herpetologists for reptile surveys, etc.) and that they possess all necessary permits and memoranda of understanding with the appropriate agencies for the handling of potentially-occurring special-status species. The lead biological monitor shall also ensure that daily monitoring reports (e.g., survey results, protective actions, results of protective actions, adaptive measures, etc.) are prepared, and shall make these monitoring reports available to LACDRP and CDFW at their request.

B-2: Pre-Construction surveys will be conducted prior to ground disturbance at each project site. These surveys will include all special-status species identified as having the potential to be present on the project site; including, but not limited to, badger, kit fox, southern grasshopper mouse, and the species listed below.

Pre-survey information gathering will include review of all available agency nest data and mapping.

- A focused pre-construction Swainson's hawk survey shall be conducted to locate any nesting sites within 5 miles of Projects 1 – 6. If Swainson's hawks or their active nests are located within 500 feet of the project sites, all construction-related work shall be postponed and CDFW will be consulted.

- Project-related activities likely to have the potential of disturbing suitable bird nesting habitat, which includes ground nesting birds, shall be prohibited from February 1 through August 31, unless a qualified monitoring biologist conducts nesting bird surveys prior to any construction-related disturbance to confirm the absence of active bird nests or bird nesting habitat. Disturbance shall be defined as any activity that physically removes or damages vegetation or habitat or any action that may cause disruption of nesting behavior such as loud noise from equipment or artificial night lighting. Surveys shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the

commencement of disturbance. If an active bird nest is discovered, disturbance within 500 feet for raptors shall be postponed until the nest is vacated, offspring are independent of the nest area and there is no evidence of further attempts at nesting. Limits of avoidance shall be marked with high-visibility flagging or fencing. The Applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures and submit the records to LACDRP and CDFW to document compliance with applicable state and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds.

- A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted on each site prior to grading. Pre-construction surveys for burrowing owl shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. The surveys shall follow the protocols set forth by the California Burrowing Owl Consortium (1993 and 2012).

  If burrowing owls are found during the pre-construction survey, then replacement burrows and habitat must be provided prior to the commencement of construction. The Applicant shall be prepared to provide artificial replacement burrows in the event that owls are detected, either as wintering or breeding individuals.

  Wintering individuals may be evicted with the use of exclusion devices followed by a period of seven days to ensure that animals have left their burrows. When it can be assured that owls are no longer using the burrows, the burrows can be hand-excavated and collapsed under the supervision of the avian biologist.

  Breeding owls must not be disturbed and must be allowed to complete the raising of young until the fledglings can forage independently of adults and it can be confirmed that further attempts at nesting shall not be undertaken. When this has been confirmed, the owls can be evicted as described above for wintering animals.

- Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for special-status ground-dwelling reptiles, including but not limited to coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard. Surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground 4 to 6 weeks in advance of the survey effort, checking weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles or other species determined important by the qualified biological monitor (i.e., biologist must be appropriately permitted for collection and relocation activities) occurring within the work area prior to the start of work shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.

B-3: During grading, earthmoving activities, and other construction activities the biological monitor shall be present to inspect and enforce all mitigation requirements and to relocate any species that may come into harm's way to an appropriate offsite location of similar habitat. The biological monitor shall be authorized to stop specific grading or construction activities if violations of mitigation measures or any local, state, or federal laws are suspected. The biological monitor shall file a report of the monitoring activities with LACDRP and CDFW during construction activities, as frequently as required by LACDRP and CDFW. If ongoing biological monitoring of construction activities reveals

the presence of any special-status reptiles within an active work area, then work shall be temporarily halted until the animals can be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones. Work areas shall be surveyed for special-status reptile species, such as the coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard, during construction activities. During the construction, surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground in appropriate work areas and checking them weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles occurring within the work area shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.

B-4: Mitigation lands shall be acquired for Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, special-status migratory and wintering birds, and alkali mariposa lily.

Swainson's hawk: Impacts due to development of the projects shall be mitigated by the acquisition of good quality Swainson's hawk habitat targeted within the Antelope Valley. Land shall be purchased or placed in a conservation easement or other suitable deed restriction and managed to maintain suitable habitat in perpetuity.

The proposed development is not expected to result in the "take" of Swainson's hawk; however, the Applicant shall be required to consult CDFW in the event of take, which may result in additional mitigation prescribed by CDFW. Although the Projects are not expected to result in "take" of Swainson's hawk, mitigation will still be required to alleviate the effects of cumulative impacts on raptor, migratory bird, and burrowing owl habitats:

Replacement land will be provided based on the quality of the mitigation land relative to the impacted habitat. The ratio of such replacement shall be determined as follows:

- A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 3 acres of development if the replacement land is superior nesting and foraging habitat contiguous to occupied nesting and foraging habitat, and is within a designated or proposed SEA.

- A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 2 acres of development if the replacement land is unoccupied irrigated land, contiguous to occupied habitat and providing superior quality foraging habitat with trees or other such nesting habitat;

- A ratio of 1 acre of replacement land for each acre of development if the replacement land provides similar foraging and nesting habitat.

Burrowing Owl: Mitigation for any occupied burrowing owl burrows found during preconstruction surveys will include a comprehensive tiered approach:

- Pre-construction and construction monitoring surveys conducted by a qualified biologist to detect potential new owl activity onsite;

- Disturbance avoidance of occupied burrows during nesting period February 1 – August 31;

- Impact avoidance of occupied burrows;

- Burrow exclusion and closure and offsite relocation (>100 m), as described previously in in B-2, will be conducted for unavoidable impacts to occupied burrows (after consultation with CDFW).

- Minimizing impacts by protecting in-place any owls, their burrows, and their immediate habitat by establishing setback zones and visual screens for burrows adjacent to construction activity; by placing visible markers, and by conducting construction worker awareness training. Setback widths will be applied as appropriate to the level of existing disturbance and owl stage of activity (e.g., for low to moderate construction-related disturbance activity outside the nesting season near burrows in currently high-traffic or disturbance areas, it is assumed owls are adapted to human disturbance and will not need a large setback).

- Mitigating unavoidable impacts to habitat: restore temporary impacts to pre-existing conditions; replace nesting/occupied and satellite burrows lost with the same number of suitable burrows on the mitigation site. Mitigation acreage for foraging habitat provided for Swainson's hawk will be sufficient to replace lost burrowing owl habitat because the hawk's replacement habitat will be in-kind or better (i.e., the Project habitat is low quality overall and mitigation habitat will be at least the same quality as the lost habitat OR will have higher quality habitat features overall, such as increased vegetative structure, higher numbers of prey species, less disturbance, and less potential for predation by domestic animals, etc.). Specific habitat considerations as provided in the CDFW 2012 burrowing owl guidance will be considered in selecting the overall habitat replacement acres for the project.

Alkali Mariposa Lily: Alkali mariposa lily will be avoided to the greatest extent possible. If preconstruction surveys reveal individuals that cannot be avoided, mitigation of lost alkali mariposa lily shall be provided at a minimum 1:1 ratio. This acreage will be calculated with input from LACDRP and CDFW. Additionally, because alkali mariposa Lilies have locally available seed sources, plantings of the lilies on appropriate soil types on Projects shall be implemented in selected areas. The lilies may also be transplanted from areas planned for disturbance to more suitable locations in the Project area. Transplantation locations must be situated within adequately buffered areas to be found suitable.

For all species the mitigation acreage may be located within the Project sites, but outside of the area of development, subject to LACDRP and CDFW approval, if acreage of sufficient quantity and quality exists.

B-5: Review and Approval of Habitat Management Lands Prior to Acquisition: The Applicant shall provide a mitigation land acquisition proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for their approval before acquiring the property. The proposal shall discuss the suitability of the property by comparing it to the selection criteria. As a part of the preparation of the land acquisition

proposal, acreage quantification by habitat category will be developed with LACDRP and CDFW based on the following criteria:

Habitat Management Land Selection Criteria: The Applicant must identify the region within which lands shall be acquired, and the type and quality of habitat to be acquired.

Detailed criteria and acreage for each habitat category will be developed with Los Angeles County and CDFW. Foraging habitat shall be assessed as moderate to good with a capacity to improve in quality and value to Swainson's hawks, and must be within the Antelope Valley Swainson's hawk breeding range. Foraging habitat with suitable nest trees is preferred.

Habitat Management Lands Acquisition: Prior to initiating ground-disturbing activities, the Applicant shall provide a proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for off-site mitigation land to be restored, enhanced, or maintained according to the requirements of the biological mitigation measures in this EIR. The proposal will require that mitigation lands identified shall be preserved as open space in perpetuity. Within 45 days of acquiring the mitigation land(s), the Applicant shall record a permanent deed restriction on the mitigation land(s) to be preserved as open space. The deed restriction or conservation easement language shall be submitted to LACDRP and CDFW for review and approval prior to recordation. Alternatively, should a conservation easement on the mitigation land be offered, the permanent conservation easement shall be recorded to the satisfaction of LACDRP and CDFW.

The Applicant shall establish a fund sufficient for the restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation land(s) until such time when the mitigation land(s) become self-sustaining and until such time as the mitigation land(s) meet the requirements of this mitigation measure. The fund shall be established within 90 days of mitigation land(s) acquisition in an amount acceptable to the LACDRP and CDFW.

Land Acquisition Schedule and Financial Assurances: The Applicant shall complete acquisition, or execute an irrevocable option to purchase, of proposed Habitat Management lands and shall provide financial assurances for dedicating adequate funding for impact avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, if necessary, prior to the issuance of building permits. If an irrevocable option to purchase is utilized, the Applicant shall provide a proposed date of purchase which coincides with construction of the facility.

B-6: Prior to alteration of any streambeds, the Applicant shall enter into an agreement with the CDFW, pursuant to Sections 1601 through 1603 of the State Fish and Game Code.

B-7: Within all interior portions of the site within and adjacent to the proposed solar arrays, re-vegetation shall be accomplished (excluding interior roads) as follows:

Vegetation seeded in these areas shall comprise locally-sourced, native species if available, or, native compatible as approved by the County biologist if sufficient locally-sourced native seed stock is not available, approximating low-growing communities such

as native perennial or annual grasslands (i.e., wildflower fields). Shrub species shall not be used due to these species inability to survive continued vegetation trimming. Vegetation shall be maintained in accordance with Los Angeles County Fire Department regulations.

2.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Project 6 would have a significant effect on Cultural Resources or Paleontological Resources if it would: cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5; cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 6 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Cultural Resources and Paleontological Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Site P19-004225, a historic-era farm complex was observed during the survey of Project 6 and was recorded. The features that made up the farm complex were demolished at some point in the past. Site P19-004225 is in ruins and lacks any physical integrity from its period of significance, and the recordation of surface artifacts has likely exhausted the date potential for the site. P19-004225 is recommended as not eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources ("CRHR") or the National Register of Historic Places ("NRHP"), and no further management consideration of the resource is necessary. Therefore, construction and operation of Project 6 can cause no change in the level of significance to a historical or archaeological resource. **(DEIR at 4.5-26; 4.5-29)**.

There is a possibility that historical and/or archaeological materials would be uncovered during necessary subsurface excavations for the construction of Project 6. Although the likelihood of encountering archaeological resources on the site is considered low, this impact is potentially significant. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, which describes procedures to be followed in the event that cultural resources are discovered, is required. CUL-1 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-26)**.

No paleontological resources were detected during the transect survey of Project 6. Based on the paleontological assessment conducted for the EIR, it is unlikely that any intact significant paleontological resources are or will be located on the Project 6 site. Therefore, Project 6 would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological

feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources. If Project excavations reach 10 feet or more below current grade and reveal that older Quaternary deposits and/or the later Miocene deposits are exposed, there will be a higher potential for encountering significant vertebrate fossil remains. Deep cuts should be inspected by a qualified paleontologist in an attempt to identify the more sensitive older alluvial strata. **(DEIR at 4.5-32)**.

There is a possibility that paleontological materials would be uncovered if excavations for the construction of the proposed Project 6 reach a depth of 10 feet or more below current grade. Although the likelihood of encountering paleontological resources within the Project 6 area is considered low, this impact is potentially significant. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure PALEO-1, the development of a Paleontological Resources Mitigation and Monitoring Plan ("PRMMP") by a qualified paleontologist is required if construction excavation depth is below 10 feet or more below current grade. PALEO-1 would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-32)**. Operation of Project 6 would not require any excavations to the depth of potential paleontological resources. There, operation of Project 6 would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources. **(DEIR at 4.5-32)**.

There is no indication that human remains are present within the boundaries of the Project 6 site. The records search and the field survey indicate no evidence of human remains on or near the sites. Project-related earth disturbance, however, has the potential to unearth previously undiscovered remains, resulting in a potentially significant impact. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2 that describes procedures to be followed in the event that human remains are discovered would ensure that impacts are reduced to a less than significant level. **(DEIR at 4.5-32)**.

Project 6 impacts related to Cultural Resources are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

CUL-1: In the event cultural resources are encountered during construction of the Projects, all ground-disturbing activities within the vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall be notified of the find. The archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to recordation and excavation of the finds and evaluation and processing of the finds in accordance with § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of, but are not limited to, stone, bone, fossils, wood or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites.

If the resources are determined to be unique historic resources as defined under § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, Mitigation Measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate Mitigation Measures for significant resources could include but not be limited to avoidance or capping,

incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds.

No further earthwork shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any archaeological artifacts recovered because of mitigation will be donated to a qualified scientific institution approved by the Lead Agency where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.

CUL-2: In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, California State Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 dictates that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to CEQA regulations and PRC § 5097.98. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.

PALEO-1: A qualified paleontologist shall be retained by the Applicant prior to excavations reaching 10 feet in depth or greater. The paleontologist shall develop and execute a PRMMP and supervise a paleontological monitor whom shall monitor all ground-disturbing activities associated with such excavations. The Program will outline the procedures to follow in regards to paleontological resources (e.g. monitoring protocols, curation, data recovery of fossils, reporting). If fossils are found during such excavation, the paleontological monitor shall be authorized to halt ground-disturbing activities within 25 feet of the find to allow evaluation of the find and determination of appropriate treatment according to the Program.

2.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Potential Effect:

Project 6 would have a significant effect on Geology and Soils if it would: expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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 active fault trace; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading; expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides; result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; 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; be located on expansive soil; have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater; or conflict with the Hillside Management Area

Ordinance or hillside design standards in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element.

Finding:

Project 6 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Geology and Soils. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 6 and the Project 6 gen-tie line are not located in an active or potentially active fault zone according to the California Geological Survey ("CGS") Seismic Hazard Zone Maps (CGS 2008) and Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map (CGS 2010). The closest fault zones are the San Andreas Fault Zone, which is located approximately 12 miles to the south southwest of the Project 6 site, and the Garlock Fault Zone, which is located approximately 20 miles northwest of the Project 6 site. Based on research and available information, Project 6 is susceptible to seismicity, but is not susceptible to fault rupture; therefore, impacts involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-14)**.

The United States Geological Survey ("USGS") National Seismic Hazard Map (2008) indicates that Project 6 and the Project 6 gen-tie line are located in an area mapped from 30 to 40 percent gravity for peak horizontal acceleration with a 10 percent probability of exceedance in the next 50 years. According to the USGS, and dependent on structural design, 10 percent gravity is the lower threshold at which damages to structures are likely to occur. Based on geologic and soil conditions at the site, the USGS Ground Motion Parameter Calculator indicates that Project 6 facilities will need to be designed to sustain spectral accelerations of approximately 0.52 to 1.313 percent gravity (USGS 2012). **(DEIR at 4.6-18)**.

Project 6 has the potential to be subjected to ground motion during construction. However, because of the temporary nature of the construction period relative to the frequency of occurrence of significant seismic events, the potential for Project 6 construction to expose people or structures to substantially adverse effects due to seismicity and ground motion will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-18)**. During operation of the facility, all Project 6 structures and operational facilities will be designed in accordance with the California Building Code ("CBC") and applicable industry standards. The design and construction of Project 6 would comply with all applicable building codes and standards established by regulatory agencies, including the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the CBC. Therefore, Project 6 impacts related to seismic shaking and strong ground motion hazards would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-18)**.

The CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) does not identify Project 6 or the Project 6 gen-tie line as being located in zones with the potential for liquefaction or ground failure. Project 6 is located on loose sand and silt deposits in the upper 40 feet of the stratigraphic section which may be susceptible to liquefaction when saturated; however, groundwater levels have remained below 100 feet bgs (USGS 2008) for approximately 60 years. Based on available geologic

information, the potential susceptibility of ground failure is less than significant for Project 6 construction and operation. **(DEIR at 4.6-19)**.

The location of Project 6 and its associated gen-tie lines contain generally low slopes of less than 1 percent gradient. As indicated in the Project description, development of the solar facility would not result in significant changes to existing site grades, and would not increase the susceptibility to slope failure. Additionally, the CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) does not identify Project 6 as being located in zones susceptible to landslides or slope failure. Therefore, the potential susceptibility for slope failure and landslides during construction and operation is less than significant for Project 6. **(DEIR at 4.6-20)**.

The soil series at the location of Project 6 and the Project 6 gen-tie line was indicated to be the Pod-Oban complex. This soil series has an erosion factor of 0.20 to 0.55, indicating a medium to high susceptibility to water erosion, and a wind erodibility group of 3, indicating a low to medium susceptibility to wind erosion. Implementation of appropriate erosion and sediment control will be implemented during construction and operation of Project 6, as outlined in Draft EIR Hydrology Section 4.9 and Air Quality Section 4.3, and will mitigate potential impacts to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.6-22)**.

Based on the information in the Geotechnical Critical Issues Analyses and Custom Soil Resource Reports prepared by Tetra Tech, the location of Project 6 and the Project 6 gen-tie line contains generally low gradient slopes. Development of solar facilities will not result in significant changes to existing site grades, and will not increase the susceptibility to slope failure. Additionally, the CGS Seismic Hazard Zone Map (CGS 2008) indicates that Project 6 is not susceptible to landslide or liquefaction hazards. **(DEIR at 4.6-24)**.

Although subsidence has occurred throughout the Antelope Valley, the majority of subsidence has been concentrated near the City of Lancaster and was caused by excessive groundwater pumping and decreased water levels. Subsidence in the vicinity of Project 6 was between 2 to 3 feet from 1930 to 1992, and there has been no surficial evidence such as fissures and differential settling observed near the Project 6 location. Based on historic rates of subsidence and a relatively stabilizing water level due to reduced pumping and proposed aquifer management, future subsidence is expected to be minimal. In the event that minor future subsidence does occur, the potential impact to the proposed structural design (post mounted racking systems and relatively small foundations for electrical equipment) would be minimal. Based on geologic data and the proposed construction and operation as described in the Project description, Project 6 impacts to on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-24)**.

The soil series at the location of Project 6 and the Project 6 gen-tie line was indicated to be the Pod-Oban complex. This soil series is rated for a low shrink/swell potential, and the potential for expansive soils to affect Project 6 is less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.6-26)**. Project 6 does not propose the use of any sanitary facilities that will require septic tanks or sanitary wastewater disposal during either construction or operation. Therefore, no impact will occur. Project 6 is located on the floor of the Antelope Valley where the terrain is nearly flat. Project 6 is not located in the hillside area, and is not affected by Hillside Management Areas. **(DEIR at 4.6-26)**.

2.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Potential Effect:

Project 6 would have a significant impact related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change if it would: generate direct or indirect GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment, based on any applicable threshold of significance; or conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 6 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 6's short-term GHG emissions during the construction phase (maximum daily emissions of 3,859 pounds per day) would not exceed the AVAQMD significance threshold for maximum daily emissions (548,000 pounds per day). As such, Project 6 would not exceed thresholds or result in violating GHG standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected GHG violation. **(DEIR at 4.7-22, 23)**.

Because construction of the six Project sites may overlap, concurrent construction emissions of Projects 1-6 were analyzed by emissions per year and thus compared to the annual GHG threshold of 100,000 metric tons of CO_{2e} per year, for long-term emissions. The unmitigated peak annual construction levels for all six Project sites are expected to result in annual GHG emissions below the most stringent annual threshold proposed by the AVAQMD (100,000 tons per year). As such, the Project will not exceed thresholds or result in violating GHG standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected GHG violation. **(DEIR at 4.7-23)**.

During operations, Project 6 facility operation would be limited to general maintenance, panel washing, and security. The primary source of emissions during operations is mainly the vehicles used by facility maintenance staff to and from the site. It is anticipated that operations and maintenance would utilize one water truck for panel washing and one light duty truck twice per year. Although Project 6 is scheduled for bi-annual panel washing, a maximum of ten trips were assumed for each Project (four round trips plus one additional round trip to be conservative). The operation emissions provided for each Project are considered the Project's baseline emissions, since it does not include any solar energy reductions. Because operations-related GHG emissions are considered long term, the AVAQMD daily significance threshold of 100,000 metric tons of CO_{2e} per year was used to analyze impacts during operations. The total annual operational emissions for Project 6 are 1.60 tons of CO_{2e} per year, which is well below the AVAQMD threshold of 100,000 tons per year. **(DEIR at 4.7-27)**. Likewise, concurrent operation of all six Projects is estimated to generate approximately 31 metric tons of CO_{2e} annually, which is well below the AVAQMD threshold. **(DEIR at 4.7-27)**.

Construction-related emissions from Project 6 would be temporary and finite in nature, below the applicable thresholds, and are consistent with the AB 32 Scoping Plan. Accordingly, Project 6's construction-related GHG emissions would not be a cumulatively considerable contribution to climate change. Project 6's operational GHG emissions would be negligible and would not comprise a cumulatively considerable contribution to climate change and, therefore, would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.7-28).**

Furthermore, with implementation of Project 6, there would be an added environmental benefit of displacing GHG emissions in the region. The solar energy generation would offset emissions from electricity usage, which would otherwise be produced by fossil-fueled power generation facilities using petroleum, natural gas, or coal combustion. Project 6 would result in a temporary increase in GHG emissions which is below the most stringent proposed threshold; employ active solar technologies supportive of the state's goals to reduce GHG emissions; and is consistent with the County of Los Angeles's goals. **(DEIR at 4.7-29)**.

Project 6 would therefore be in accordance with the state's need for the construction of renewable energy power plants to meet the state's GHG reduction objectives including:

- California's RPS that requires California's investor-owned electric utilities to obtain 20 percent of the electricity that they supply by 2010 from renewable sources;

- Executive Order S-14-08, which established the RPS targets for California that "all retail sellers of electricity shall serve 33 percent of their load with renewable energy by 2020";

- Executive Order S-03-05 on climate change to advance renewable energy and other solutions to reduce California's GHG emissions; and

- The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) that established a comprehensive program of regulatory and market mechanisms to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020.

Project 6 includes various project design features and objectives that address global climate change and reduce GHG emissions, as do each of the Projects 1-6. Project design features include aspects of the Project that either must be incorporated as part of the conditions of approval, or that the Applicant has committed to include to reduce GHG impacts associated with the Project. The Projects would be designed to reduce emissions through specific goals set. The expected Project features would directly or indirectly result in lower emissions of GHGs. The Project design features that address global climate change impacts include the following:

- Vegetation to sequester GHGs
    - Preserve natural areas by mowing, which maintains the organic material in the soil
    - Preserve open space by limiting constructing on portions of Project site
    - Plant trees and shrubs along the edges as buffers to adjacent receptors

- Construction limitations to minimize GHG emissions

- Limit construction equipment idling beyond regulation requirements
- Limit number of simultaneous construction projects by phasing

As such, Project 6 would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation to reduce GHG emissions. **(DEIR at 4.7-30)**. In addition to the Project design features listed above, the Project's impacts related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

GHG-1 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.

GHG-2 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not idle more than five minutes in any one hour.

GHG-3 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operations of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.

GHG-4 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.

GHG-5 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.

2.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Potential Effect:

Project 6 would have a significant effect on Hazards and Hazardous Materials if it would: create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment; emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses; be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; for a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; for a project within

the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires, due to location within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4); expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, due to location within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires due to location within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires due to location within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard; or constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 6 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 6 would not require extensive or ongoing use of hazardous materials. Hazardous materials used during the construction of Project 6 would be typical of most construction projects of this type. Hazardous materials used during construction activities may include gasoline, diesel fuel, oils, lubricants, solvents, detergents, degreasers, paints, and other supplies. All hazardous materials would be transported, stored, and properly disposed of in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. The accidental release of hazardous materials or wastes during construction activities is possible. The accidental release of hazardous materials or wastes would be promptly contained and abated in accordance with all applicable laws and regulatory requirements, and therefore is not expected to result in a significant impact. **(DEIR at 4.8-11)**. During operation of Project 6, limited quantities of hazardous materials would be stored on-site. These materials would include fire suppressant and transformer insulating oil (mineral oil). The mineral oil would be contained within Project 6 electrical transformers and switches. Project 6 would develop and implement a hazardous materials and hazardous waste management program for both construction and operational phases. The program would include the following, as required by applicable regulations. **(DEIR at 4.8-11)**.

- **Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste Handling:** The construction contractor would prepare a Project-specific hazardous materials management and hazardous waste management program for Project 6. This program would be implemented prior to the start of construction activities. The program would prescribe proper hazardous material use, storage, and disposal requirements, as well as hazardous waste management procedures. The program would identify specific types of hazardous materials to be used during Project 6 construction and operation, and specific types of wastes that will be generated. All personnel would be provided with Project-specific training. These programs would be developed to ensure that all hazardous materials and hazardous wastes would be handled and disposed of in a safe and environmentally sound manner consistent with all

applicable laws and regulations. Employees and contractor personnel handling wastes would receive hazardous materials training and be trained in hazardous waste procedures, spill contingencies, waste minimization procedures and treatment, storage, and disposal facility ("TSDF") training in accordance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration ("OSHA") Hazard Communication Standard and 22 CCR. Prior to the start of construction of Project 6, a Hazardous Materials Business Plan ("HMBP") will be prepared and submitted in accordance with Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code and Title 22 CCR, as required by the Certified Unified Program Agency.

- **Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan:** The construction contractor would prepare a site-specific SWPPP for review and approval by the appropriate regulatory agencies and implement it prior to the start of demolition or construction activities at Project 6. The SWPPP would utilize BMPs to address the storage and handling of hazardous materials and sediment runoff during demolition and construction activities.

- **Transport of Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Wastes:** Hazardous materials transported by truck would include fuel (diesel fuel and gasoline) and oils and lubricants for equipment. Transportation of hazardous waste may include hazardous building materials and small amounts of construction waste such as waste oils, solvents, or cleaners. The construction contractor would prepare written procedures for the transport of hazardous materials and hazardous waste in accordance with the California Vehicle Code, California Highway Patrol Regulations (CCR Title 13); Department of Transportation Regulations, Title 49, CFR; and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regulations, Title 40 CFR, and CCR 22 regulations prior to the start of construction activities at Project 6.

- **Fueling and Maintenance of Construction Equipment:** The construction contractor would prepare written procedures for the fueling and maintenance of construction equipment prior to the start of construction activities at Project 6. Vehicles and equipment would be refueled off-site or on-site by refueling trucks. If on-site refueling or maintenance activities are required, refueling and maintenance procedures would include implementation of BMPs to ensure that chemicals do not come in contact with the ground. Equipment will be inspected daily for potential leakage or failures.

- **Emergency Release Response Procedures:** The construction contractor would prepare an Emergency Release Response Plan ("ERRP") detailing the response to releases of hazardous materials. The ERRP would be prepared prior to the start of construction activities at Project 6. The ERRP would prescribe hazardous materials handling procedures for reducing the potential for a release during construction activities, and would include an emergency response program to ensure the rapid and safe cleanup of any accidental spills. All hazardous material spills of threatened release would be immediately reported. All construction and operations personnel would be aware of federal, state, and local emergency response reporting guidelines. Implementation of the aforementioned hazardous materials and hazardous waste management programs would reduce the potential impacts associated with the handling, transport, and use of hazardous

materials during both construction and operation of Project 6 to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.8-12)**.

If lead based paint is found during construction of Project 6, the Applicant would comply with County requirements and provide a copy of the qualifications/license of the lead based paint abatement contractor that will perform the abatement or removal of lead based paint to the Department of Public Works Building and Safety Division and the County of Los Angeles Fire Department Health and Hazardous Materials Division. If required by the County, the Applicant would prepare and submit a Hazardous Building Materials Demolition Assessment and Management Plan to the Department of Public Works and Fire Department for review and approval to ensure compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local laws, and regulations. OSHA regulations are in place to assure that these materials are safely removed prior to or during demolition and renovation activities. In compliance with regulations requiring removals by firms and individuals licensed to do such work pursuant to applicable regulations the Project's potential impacts regarding lead exposure would be less than significant. Implementation of the aforementioned ERRP would reduce the potential impacts associated with upset and accidental release conditions at Project 6 (and gen-tie lines) to less than significant levels. **(DEIR at 4.8-13)**.

Project 6 would convert sunlight directly into electrical energy without the creation of hazardous emissions, and no impact to sensitive land uses would occur as a result of hazardous emissions. The primary emissions created by Project 6 (and gen-tie lines) would be air emissions from vehicle and equipment exhaust generated during construction activities. Potential impacts due to air emissions created during construction and maintenance activities at Project 6 would be less than significant, as discussed in Section 4.3 of the DEIR. **(DEIR at 4.8-13)**.

Based on the Environmental Data Review ("EDR"), the location of Project 6 and the Project 6 gen-tie line is not located at a known site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites complied pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No known releases have occurred at Project 6 or adjacent to Project 6. Based on the information compiled in the EDR, Project 6 would have no impact due to site hazards to the public and environment during construction or operations. **(DEIR at 4.8-14)**.

Project 6 is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Based upon a review of the *General William J. Fox Airfield Land Use Compatibility Plan*, Project 6 and the Project 6 gen-tie line are located within the General William J. Fox Airfield land use plan. Project 6 is located in General William J. Fox Airfield's Zone E: Other Airport Environs. Generally, there is no concern with regard to any object up to 100 feet tall within Zone E. In addition, the Airport Land Use Commission ("ALUC") has stated that ALUC review of Project 6 is not required. Therefore, Project 6 impacts to public airports or public use airports would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.8-16)**.

Emergency response and evacuation procedures for Project 6 would be coordinated by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department ("LACSD") and the Los Angeles County Fire Department ("LACFD"). During Project 6 construction activities, the LACSD and LACFD require that adequate vehicular access be provided and maintained. The Traffic Control Plan for Project 6

would provide for the required access of emergency vehicles during construction activities. During operation of Project 6, Project operation staff would work with both the LACSD and the LACFD to ensure adequate emergency procedures are in place. The HMBP would include an Emergency Response Plan. Additionally, an Emergency Action Plan and a Fire Prevention Plan would be prepared for Project 6 as required by Cal/OSHA. These plans would ensure that Project 6 would have established plans and procedures for responding to emergency situations, and would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, Project 6 impacts to emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans would be less than significant during both construction and operations. **(DEIR at 4.8-17)**.

Project 6 is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. No impact would occur in this regard. **(DEIR at 4.8-17)**. A public water system for fire control does not exist near Project 6. The facility design includes a dedicated 10,000-gallon fire water storage tank to be installed and maintained at Project 6, in compliance with LACFD Regulation 19 and other applicable Fire Department water tank specifications. Because the SGF design includes a dedicated fire water tank meeting Fire Department requirements, the water and pressure would meet fire flow needs. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.8-18)**.

Project 6 is surrounded by rural agricultural lands with no industrial uses, manufacturing uses, or other particularly high fire hazard uses in the vicinity. Project 6 would comply with all applicable Fire Code and County and City ordinance requirements, and fire safety standards, as stated in DEIR Section 4.12 Public Safety. A Fire Management Plan, which would be prepared for Project 6, establishes standards and practices that would minimize the risk of fire and, in the event of fire, provide for immediate suppression and notification. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(DEIR at 4.8-18)**.

Project 6 will convert sunlight into electrical energy through a process which would not constitute a fire hazard. All materials and equipment used in the construction of each facility would be specified based on applicable codes and building regulations. Welding activities may also potentially result in the combustion of brush and vegetation. A Fire Protection and Prevention Plan would reduce these potential impacts to less than significant. A Fire Prevention Plan would be prepared for Project 6 as required by Cal/OSHA, and Project 6 would include a dedicated 10,000- gallon fire water storage tank in compliance with LACFD Regulation 19. Therefore, Project 6 does not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard, and would have a less than significant impact on fire hazards in the area. **(DEIR at 4.8-19)**.

Project 6 impacts related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

HH-1 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Materials Management and Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.

HH-2 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.

HH-5 Construction activities shall be halted if previously unidentified soil contamination is observed or indicated by testing during any earthwork activities. Construction will be halted or redirected until such soil contamination is evaluated and disposed of and/or treated.

2.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Project 6 would have a potentially significant impact on Hydrology and Water Quality if it would: violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; 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; substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; 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; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality; conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52); result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance; use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course); otherwise substantially degrade water quality; 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, or within a floodway or floodplain; place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain; 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; or place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 6 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

A Notice of Intent form would be submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board ("SWRCB") to apply for coverage under the NPDES General Permit for construction of Project 6. During construction, Project 6 would implement BMPs as specified in the site-specific SWPPP. The SWPPP would be developed by a State of California certified Qualified SWPPP Developer ("QSD") and during construction monitored by a State of California certified Qualified SWPPP Practitioner ("QSP"). The SWPPP would be approved by the County and uploaded to the State via the State SMARTs system prior to Project 6 ground-breaking. The SWPPP would identify construction-phase BMPs to be implemented. With implementation of the BMPs, Project 6 and its associated gen-tie lines would only have the potential to generate less than significant effects on groundwater and/or stormwater runoff, and will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during construction. **(DEIR at 4.9-34; 4.9-38)**.

During Project 6 operations, mechanical equipment on the solar farm would either be made of pollutant free materials or fitted with special containment units to house any possible drips or spills of lubricants, oils, or other chemicals. Maintenance activities, including solar array washing, would be performed with clean water and allowed to evaporate or drip to the ground. Maintenance and operations personnel would be required to maintain all necessary spill prevention, control, and countermeasures on hand during site visits. These spill response kits would include, but are not limited to, personal protective equipment, spill pads, absorbents, booms, shovels, garbage bags, plastic sheeting, and disposal drums. Permanent treatment BMPs would include infiltration basins to preserve water quality. With these spill prevention, control, and countermeasures on-site, there would be a less than significant impact on groundwater and stormwater runoff quality, and Project 6 will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during operation. **(DEIR at 4.9-34; 4.9-38).**

As stated in Section 4.14.5 of the DEIR, water would be required for dust control measures during the duration of construction efforts. An analysis of the water supply, including the use of well water, is presented in DEIR Section 4.14 Utilities and Service Systems. At the outset of construction, water would be supplied via truck to meet the demands of Project 6. Well water is not considered available at this time, and would be reevaluated upon a change in status. The demands of Project 6 are anticipated to have a less than significant impact on the region's groundwater supplies. Furthermore, construction activities are not anticipated to interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. As stated in Section 4.14.5 of the DEIR, water may be required in the first few years of operation to establish the mature vegetation planted after construction. Similar to the construction period, water would be supplied via truck to Project 6. The volume of water required would be considerably less than the water required for construction activities. Well water would be considered if its availability changes. As with construction, impacts to the region's groundwater supplies are anticipated to be less than significant with operation of Project 6. Also, the effect on groundwater recharge by the development's increase in impervious surface will be mitigated by the proposed infiltration basins. These infiltration basins will allow the increase in runoff volume from the proposed development (up to the 25-year storm event) to infiltrate on-site and recharge the groundwater basin. Therefore, less than significant impacts to groundwater recharge are anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-35)**.

During construction of Project 6 and its associated gen-tie lines, soils would be disturbed through activities such as minor grading and vegetation removal, which could lead to issues with soil erosion and siltation on- and off-site. Through the implementation of construction control measures per California Association of Stormwater Quality Agencies ("CASQA") standards (silt fencing, fiber rolls, and sandbag barriers), Project 6 would have less than significant impacts on erosion and debris deposition during construction (CASQA 2003). Project 6 and its associated gen-tie lines would require minor grading on-site which would not drastically change the existing drainage patterns or natural channels. Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan ("SUSMP")/Low Impact Development ("LID") Reports would help account for the increase in runoff erosion capabilities resulting from the developments' increase in impervious surfaces. The infiltration basins would help reduce flow velocities and the sediment load of the runoff, which would lower the erosion and siltation capabilities of the runoff. Therefore, Project 6 would result in less than significant impacts to erosion and siltation on- and off-site. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Project 6 and its associated gen-tie lines would require minor grading on-site, which would not drastically change the existing drainage patterns or natural channels. The increase in runoff flow rates and volumes from the developments' increase in impervious surfaces would be addressed by Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7. The infiltration basins, created by elevated road sections, would capture the increase in runoff volume (up to the 25-year storm event) and allow it to infiltrate on-site. The remaining runoff would flow over the road section and return to pre-development flow conditions before leaving the project site. With this measure, less than significant impacts would occur related to flooding on- and off-site. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7 would address the increase in runoff flow rates and volumes from the developments' increase in impervious surfaces. The infiltration basins, created by elevated road sections, would capture the increase in runoff volume (up to the 25-year storm event) and allow it to infiltrate on-site. The remaining runoff would flow over the road section and return to predevelopment flow conditions before leaving the Project site. The basins would be placed within the first half of the site to allow flows over the roads sections enough time to normalize before leaving Project 6. Project soils would treat the captured runoff at the infiltration basins. Therefore, less than significant impacts to existing or planned stormwater drainage systems are anticipated. Also, significant impacts to polluted runoff are not anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-36)**.

Project 6 and its associated gen-tie lines would incorporate Los Angeles County LID standards, while following the requirements of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works ("LACDPW"). Existing on-site drainage patterns and channels would not be significantly altered by the Projects' minimal grading, and all off-site drainage patterns and channels would not be significantly impacted either. Best Management Practices and the Hydrology Study/Drainage Concept/SUSMP/LID Reports located in DEIR Appendix B-7 would allow the developments' increase in runoff (up to the 25-year storm event) to be both infiltrated and treated on-site. This also minimizes downstream impacts by returning to predevelopment flow conditions. Therefore, Project 6 will not conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance. **(DEIR at 4.9-38)**.

Project 6 and its associated gen-tie lines are not in the vicinity of any SWRCB-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated. During construction, wastewater treatment systems would not be necessary. The Projects would contract services to supply and maintain portable toilets. Therefore, the impacts of Project 6 to the quality of groundwater and surface water would be less than significant during construction. The same portable toilet services would be contracted for operations. Temporary portable toilet services would be delivered during the required maintenance periods on an as needed basis. As a result, there would be less than significant impacts to the water quality of groundwater and surface water during Project 6 operations. **(DEIR at 4.9-39)**.

Project 6 is located within a 100-year flood hazard area. Some of the proposed infiltration basins within Project 6, created by elevated road sections, cross the 100-year flow area. Once full, runoff will flow over the elevated road section. These basins have been placed in the first half of the Project 6 site to allow the flows to normalize and return to their pre-development sheet flow condition before leaving the Project 6 site. Therefore, the proposed basins will not significantly impede or redirect the flood flows. Project 6 does not involve the construction of housing. Therefore, no housing will be placed within a 100-year flood hazard area, and no impacts are anticipated. **(DEIR at 4.9-39, 40)**.

Project 6 and its associated gen-tie lines are not within the immediate vicinity of any levees or dams which would place people or structures at risk of significant loss, injury or death in the event of a failure. In the event of a failure of the aqueduct near Project 6, the distance between the site and the aqueduct would allow the flow to dissipate. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated. Project 6 has slopes that are very mild, at less than two percent. Therefore, high mudflow conditions are not anticipated. Accordingly, Project 6 will not place structures in an area subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow. **(DEIR at 4.9-40)**.

Project 6 impacts related to Hydrology and Water Quality are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

HYDRO-1 Education and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants and Employees. Appropriate educational materials and training for preventing stormwater pollution and additional BMP Fact Sheets from the California Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks can be found at www.cabmphandbooks.com. Practical information material will be provided to employees on general good housekeeping practices. These materials will describe, but are not limited to, spill prevention and control and the use of chemicals, petroleum products, pesticides and fertilizers that should be limited to the property, with no discharge of wastes directly or indirectly to gutters, catch basins or the storm drain system. Information will be distributed directly to the employees as well as being posted in public areas. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities. The required materials shall be available at each project site and a log kept to show education has occurred prior to the start of construction.

HYDRO-2 A spill contingency plan will be prepared by the owner/building operator. As a minimum the Spill Contingency Plan will "mandate the stockpiling of cleanup materials, notification of responsible agencies, disposal of cleanup materials and documentation." This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-3 No hazardous materials are anticipated to be stored on-site. If hazardous materials are required to be stored on-site, a designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in accordance with requirements of the Health & Safety Code and store the materials according to applicable regulations. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-4 A designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in compliance with the current requirements of the County of Los Angeles Fire Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.

HYDRO-5 Site waste receptacles shall be emptied on a weekly basis or more often to prevent containers from overflowing. Upon inspection any debris or rubbish will be picked up and the site cleaned. The trash area is NOT to be cleaned by hosing down. The type of materials used to clean the area and storage of said materials will be determined by the Contractor. Signage will be posted that lids shall be kept closed at all times. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 at all times during facility operations.

2.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Potential Effect:

Project 6 would have a significant effect related to Land Use and Planning if it would: physically divide an established community; be inconsistent with applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to, the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans; be inconsistent with the zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject properties; or conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria.

Finding:

Project 6 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Land Use and Planning. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 6 is located within a sparsely populated area, and is not located within any established community. The closest established community is Antelope Acres, which is located

approximately 1.4 miles north of Project 3, the nearest of the six Project sites. Project 6 is located in an area that has been characterized by agricultural uses for several decades, and has been in transition to residential uses or vacant land. Project 6 would not physically alter the community, would not divide any community, or change any public access routes to them. Impacts would be considered to be less than significant. Likewise, Project 6's proposed gen-tie lines would not result in physical improvements that would result in dividing an established community, and the proposed gen-tie line would be located within a public right-of-way or an easement on private land. Therefore, Project 6 would not divide an established community, and impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.10-36)**.

Project 6 is not located within the boundaries of a Community Standards District; therefore, no district development standards apply to Project 6. The Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan designates the Project 6 site as N-1, Non-Urban use. According to the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, allowable uses in the N-1 designation include utility installations (County of Los Angeles 1986). Project 6 is considered a utility installation, and therefore would be consistent with the N-1 land use designation. As a result, Project 6 would be consistent with the General Plan Land Use designation. Development of Project 6 will be consistent with permissible uses associated with the land use designation and the policies, goals, and objectives outlined in the Los Angeles County General Plan and the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, and will not be inconsistent with any applicable County plan. **(DEIR at 4.10-36)**.

The gen-tie lines for Project 6 are linear infrastructure that would not result in any changes to the existing land use patterns in the area of Project 6. The gen-tie lines would be located underground within Los Angeles County to the extent practicable, and aboveground within the City of Lancaster, either in a public road ROW or on private lands adjacent to the public road ROW. Within the City of Lancaster, the gen-tie line routes would traverse land use designations "NU" Residential and "UR" in the City of Lancaster. According to the County's Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, allowable uses in the N-1 designation include utility installations. Additionally, the City's NU land use designation permits solar generating facilities and utility installations within its designation. In July 2013, the City approved a General Plan Amendment for the UR designation to NU designation for another applicant's solar project that the gen-tie line would traverse to connect to the Antelope Substation. A franchise agreement will be obtained by the Applicant with the City of Lancaster for the gen-tie line that will traverse through this jurisdiction. This agreement will grant a utility franchise and right of way privileges for the proposed gen-tie line. Therefore, no impact to County and City Plans would occur**.** **(DEIR at 4.10-37)**.

The Project 6 and associated gen-tie line would be located within the Fox Airfield Airport Influence Area ("AIA"), Zone E. Prohibited uses under Zone E include hazards to flight (Los Angeles County ALUC 2004). Hazards to flight include physical (e.g. tall objects), visual, and electronic forms of interference with the safety of aircraft operations. Land use development that may cause the attraction of birds to increase is also prohibited. Project 6 and its associated gen-tie line would be consistent with the Fox Airfield Land Use Compatibility Plan. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.10-37)**.

The County's CUP entitlement process involves the discretionary review of a project, whereby conditions of approval for Project 6 would be assigned. A CUP Burden of Proof is required to be submitted to determine Project 6's consistency with the General Plan, compatibility with surrounding land uses, conditions to ensure compatibility, land suitability and physical constraints, project design, availability of adequate access, public services and facilities to serve the development, and identify potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures. As shown in DEIR Tables 4.10-1, 4.10-2, and 4.10-3, Project 6 is consistent with County land use designations and compatible with adjacent and surrounding land uses. **(DEIR at 4.10-43)**. The implementation of the environmental mitigation measures and CUP conditions would be expected to minimize Project 6's potential impacts, such that the Project could occur while maintaining zoning compliance within the designated zone. As a result, Project 6 would be consistent with the County's zoning designations. Permitting processes for those portions of the gen-tie lines located in the City of Lancaster would require necessary approvals from the City. Compliance with applicable City zoning regulations and conditions would ensure consistency with City's zoning designations. **(DEIR at 4.10-38)**.

Project 6 is located within the Desert Mountain (D-2) zone. Under the County's zoning code for Zone D-2 (Los Angeles Code Section 22.32.090), any use permitted in Zone A-2 and Light Manufacturing (M-1) is permitted under Zone D-2. Electric generating facilities, solar generating facilities, and transmission substations are permitted under Zones A-2 and M-1; Project 6 and gen-tie line are therefore permitted under Zone D-2 with a CUP. The proposed Project 6 gen-tie line would be constructed underground within Los Angeles County, unless other applicable regulations require above-ground installation. The gen-tie line would be located on private lands adjacent to the public road ROW or within the public road ROW. The gen-tie line is linear infrastructure that would not result in any changes to the existing land use patterns in the proposed Project area, and would be permitted as part of the CUP. As a result, implementation of the proposed Project 6 and gen-tie line would be expected to be consistent with the zoning designation. Therefore, Project 6 and its associated gen-tie line would result in a less than significant impact relative to the D-2 zoning in Los Angeles County. **(DEIR at 4.10-39)**.

As discussed in DEIR Section 4.4 Biological Resources, Project 6 and its associated gen-tie lines are not located within a designated SEA; therefore, SEA conformance criteria do not apply. Project 6 and the area for its associated gen-tie lines contain generally low slopes of less than 1 percent gradient, and would not be located within or conflict with designated Hillside Management Areas. Therefore, no impacts would occur. **(DEIR at 4.10-39)**.

Project 6 is not located within an Agricultural Opportunity Area. **(DEIR at 4.10-41)**. Project 6 contain no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance **(DEIR at 4.10-40)**. No railroads are located within 0.5 miles from Project 6 and gen-tie line. The nearest major highway is State Route 14, which is located approximately one mile east of Project 6. Project 6 is located approximately 2.16 miles north of Fox Airfield and is located within Zone E of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for Fox Airfield. Zone E contains areas beyond the 55 CNEL contour and represents areas where sounds from the airport are not a concern, or in other words are low level such that sounds from operation of the airport largely blend in with the ambient background noise. Sound levels for Project 6 would be less than 55 dBA outside of the Project limits and therefore, less than significant with regard to any noise management area. **(DEIR at 4.10-42)**.

Project 6 and its gen-tie line are located entirely within Zone A of the 100 year floodplain. Measures would be taken in the design of the gen-tie lines to account for the flood hazards. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. **(DEIR at 4.10-41)**.

2.11 NOISE

Potential Effect:

Project 6 would have a significant Noise impact if it would: result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the project; result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; for a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels; or, for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 6 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Noise.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Construction of Project 6 would take place between the second and third quarters of 2014. Sound generated from Project 6 would consist of: (1) short duration sounds resulting from construction activities, and (2) sound during normal facility operations. Vibration from Project 6 would only result during construction. Construction activities would take place only during daytime hours. An evaluation of expected noise and vibration levels was performed, and the ability of Project 6 to comply with applicable noise requirements was assessed.

The Draft EIR determined that the construction noise for Project 6 would be similar to that of Project 1; therefore, the Draft EIR's discussion of Project 6's noise impacts focused on the differences between Project 1 and Project 6, namely received sound levels at the nearest noise sensitive receptor. **(DEIR at 4.11-44)**. These Findings refer to certain facts from the Draft EIR's discussion of Project 1 noise impacts that are also applicable to Project 6.

For Project 6, the following criteria were determined to be inapplicable or to result in no impact:

- Exposure of on-site workers to noise levels that exceed occupational safety standards (90 dBA as a time-weighted 8-hour average or peak noise levels above 115 dBA).

- Exposure of residents to airport or private airstrip-related noise levels above a CNEL of 65 dBA.

Occupational noise exposure is governed by federal and state regulations. Cal/OSHA administers industrial safety regulations in California. Cal/OSHA regulations establish a time-weighted noise exposure limit of 90 dBA averaged over 8 hours (CCR, Title 8, Article 105). Noise source controls, administrative procedures, or worker hearing protection must be provided if worker noise exposure would exceed the 90 dBA limit. The construction contractor selected for the Project would be required to follow Cal/OSHA requirements for construction worker noise exposure. **(DEIR at 4.11-25; 4.11-30)**.

Sound from construction equipment would vary, depending on the construction phase and the number and class of equipment at a location at any given time. Actual received sound levels would fluctuate, depending on the construction activity, equipment type, and separation distances between source and receiver. **(DEIR at 4.11-30)**. Construction noise is a temporary noise source that would only occur during daytime hours. Sound levels from construction are expected to be comparable to sound produced by farm machinery, such as equipment used in nearby agricultural fields. Worst case construction noise levels for the nearest residence would last no more than a few weeks, as construction activities progress across Project 6. Therefore, no one residence would be exposed to significant noise levels for any extended period of time. **(DEIR at 4.11-27)**.

Sound from pile driving would attenuate to 76 dBA at the nearest residence to Project 6, and would attenuate to below 60 dBA within 1 linear mile of this construction activity, depending on meteorological and topographical effects. The average noise level from pile driving is predicted to be 68 dBA, similar to the level resulting at the Project centroid located 1,300 feet from the nearest residence. Because sound levels would be higher than 60 dBA at times, and up to 76 dBA at the closest residence, an exceedance of the County's construction noise level limits is anticipated. Therefore, where pile driving is planned to occur within 3,000 feet of an occupied noise sensitive receptor, an acoustic curtain or sound barrier with a sound transmission class of 19 or greater will be used to reduce received sound levels at the noise sensitive receptors to levels at or below the County's construction noise limit of 60 dBA. Pile driving is expected to last more than 10 days, and a variance from the County of Los Angeles noise ordinance will be required. **(DEIR at 4.11-45)**.

Traffic noise generated during construction of Project 6 on and offsite would temporarily add to overall sound levels. As a general construction practice, functional mufflers would be maintained on all equipment to maintain noise levels as low as reasonably achievable. The Project 6 Applicant would make reasonable efforts to minimize noise resulting from construction activities, as described in Mitigation Measures N1 - N6. In sum, with mitigation measures implemented, including the use of sound curtains or barriers during pile driving, construction sound levels would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.11-27; 4.11-31)**.

The average vibration level generated by Project 6 construction activities will be 0.01 PPV, which would be barely perceptible to humans. Similar to the noise from pile driving, vibration from pile driving would only last for a few weeks at most, and would move throughout the Project rapidly with no single noise sensitive receptor experiencing the peak 0.03 PPV for more

than a few hours, which will be perceptible but will not damage structures. Therefore, exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels due to the construction of Project 6 and the gen-tie line will be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.11-50, 51)**.

Project 6 would be located 2.3 miles from General William J. Fox Airfield and 4.5 miles from Little Buttes Antique Airfield. Project 6 would be within Zone E of the General William J. Fox Airfield land use compatibility plan (Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission 2004). Project 6 is not a residential or commercial use that would subject residents or workers to noise impacts from the airport. Little Buttes Antique Airfield is a low use airport, and no sound contours have been prepared for this airfield. Because of low operation levels at Little Buttes Antique Airfield and distance from both airports, sound levels from both airfields are assumed to be below 55 dBA CNEL. Project 6 would not create residential land uses, and all Project features are outside the airfield area of influence. In addition to not creating any residential development, Project 6 would only have a temporary impact on construction workers. Consequently, there are no impacts from airport-related noise.

Once operational, Project 6 would generate power using PV modules mounted in rows of parallel racks. The Project is anticipated to be unmanned during normal operation. Systems monitoring would be completed remotely and onsite staff would be limited to repair or cleaning of the PV modules. Maintenance staff would visit two times per year to clean the PV modules, seasonally to clear vegetation, and as needed to perform other general maintenance activities. **(DEIR at 4.11-35)**. Sound sources considered in the operational acoustic analysis include the inverters and transformers associated with the PV modules, the substation, and the transmission line. The principal sources of noise are the cooling-ventilation fans, the electrical components of the inverters and the step-up transformers at the on-site substations. Gen-tie lines for Project 6 would be aboveground, and therefore corona noise could occur. However, because corona noise is typically attributed to higher voltage lines of approximately 345 kV and above, noise complaints from the Project's lower voltage transmission lines (66 kV) are not anticipated. These sound sources are all predicted to be less than 35 dBA at nearby noise sensitive receptors, and would be less than significant. Overall, operational sound sources are all predicted to be less than 35 dBA at nearby noise-sensitive receptors, and would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.11-45 to 4.11-46)**.

Project 6 impacts related to Noise are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

N-1 Construction operations would not occur between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday, or at any time on Sunday with the exception of limited low-noise generating potential night work with Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning and Public Works approval.

N-2 Construction site and access road maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour shall be established and enforced during the construction period.

N-3 Electrically-powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, except for devices like trucks, loaders, dozers, and other heavy equipment.

N-4 Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far as practicable, and no closer than 1,000 feet, from noise-sensitive receptors.

N-5 The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells are prohibited except where required by OSHA or for safety or emergency warning purposes required by other regulatory agencies.

N-6 Project-related public address or music systems used on-site shall not be audible at any adjacent receptor.

N-7 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 which are in compliance with any applicable legally required equipment noise standards. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors) shall be equipped with shrouds and/or other noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment. Mobile sound barriers with a sound transmission class of 19 or greater will be used for pile driving on Projects where received sound levels at the nearest noise sensitive receptor are predicted to be above the County construction noise limit of 60 dBA during the day. With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may need to incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including:

N-9 The Applicant shall use NEMA low noise rated transformer equipment which will achieve 10 dBA or greater noise reduction as compared to standard NEMA-rated transformers of a similar size and rated capacity to ensure that Project noise impacts would be less than significant.

2.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

Potential Effect:

Project 6 would have a significant impact on Public Services if it would create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection; sheriff protection; schools; parks; libraries, or other public facilities.

Finding:

Project 6 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Public Services. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Project 6 is located within the LACFD Battalion 11 service area. Station 112, which is 5.6 miles southwest of Project 6, is the jurisdictional station (i.e. the first-responder) to respond to incidents at the site. Additional fire stations within Battalion 11 (identified in DEIR Table 4.12-1) would also potentially be dispatched to respond to fire protection needs at the site. **(DEIR at 4.12-10)**.

During construction, workers would be temporary and would not be expected to relocate to the Project 6 area, as they would mostly be hired from the available local workforce, and would not be expected to result in significant changes to the local population; therefore, the construction of Project 6 is not anticipated to create significant changes to the local population that would increase the level of demand on fire protection services or that would increase the level of demand on the fire department services such that additional staff would be needed. **(DEIR at 4.12-10)**.

As discussed in DEIR Section 4.13, Transportation and Traffic, construction of Project 6 would not result in significant traffic impacts. However, Project 6 would involve construction of an underground 0.02 mile gen-tie line across West Avenue D. Transmission line construction would require work in the public road ROW, including limited encroachment into the traveled roadway. It is anticipated that the construction of the Project 6 gen-tie line would only require partial street closures, which provide better emergency access than full street closures. Worksite traffic control plans, permits, and coordination with County departments will be required regarding potential construction impacts to West Avenue D. Additionally, the LACFD Fire Stations 33, 112, and 130 would be notified at a minimum of three days in advance of any street closures that may affect fire/paramedic responses in the area. In the event that Project 6 would require street closures, alternate route details (detour plans) and the schedule of closures would be submitted to the LACFD prior to construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TT-3 would minimize potential effects to West Avenue D such that the impact to LACFD access and response times would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-10)**.

Based on the Applicant's commitment to conformance of construction activities at the Project 6 site and gen-tie line ROW to federal, state, and Los Angeles County ordinances for fire protection, and implementation of mitigation related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials, construction would not be expected to result in significant special fire problems or hazards. Additionally, construction traffic at the site would not be anticipated to have a significant impact on local intersections and road segments. Therefore, Project 6 impacts to LACFD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-10)**.

Operations activities at Project 6 would typically be associated with routine maintenance carried out on-site and along the associated gen-tie ROWs at periodic intervals by a small maintenance

crew. These activities would not result in effects to LACFD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection during operations of Project 6; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. In addition, the Applicant would be required to pay taxes as per the Proposition E Special Tax and property tax assessments, which are allocated to the LACFD. These taxes are designed to provide for potential increases in LACFD fire protection service demands to accommodate for new and existing developments. **(DEIR at 4.12-11).**

The Project 6 site is located within the LACSD Field Operations Region 1 service area. The Lancaster Station, which is approximately 6.1 miles southeast of Project 6, would likely be the first responder to incidents at the site. Currently the station maintains an officer-to-population service ratio of approximately 1 to 1,000. Project 6 does not involve any residential uses, and would not be considered to result in significant increases to population. During construction, workers would be temporary, and would not be expected to relocate to the area as they would mostly be hired from the available local workforce. The employees are planned to be hired from the available local workforce, and would not be expected to result in significant changes to the local population that would increase the level of demand on law enforcement services. **(DEIR at 4.12-14)**.

Sheriff services potentially required at Project 6 would likely include incidents of vandalism or theft. While these incidents would require sheriff services, they are not considered emergency response incidents, and as such would not affect emergency response times. As discussed in DEIR Section 4.13, Transportation and Traffic, construction of Project 6 would not result in significant traffic impacts, and any impacts associated with street closures due to installation of the underground gen-tie lines will be addressed through the use of worksite traffic control plans, permits, and coordination with County departments regarding potential construction impacts to West Avenue D. Therefore, impacts from the construction of Project 6 to LACSD service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for sheriff protection would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-14)**.

Project 6 and its associated gen-tie lines do not include residential development or the influx of long-term workers from outside the area, and accordingly would not generate population growth. Consequently, no new demands on school facilities, parks, library facilities or other public facilities are expected, and no impact would occur to these facilities. **(DEIR at 4.12-15; 4.12-16)**.

2.13 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Potential Effect:

Project 6 would have a significant impact on Transportation and Traffic if it would: conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit; 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; result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks; substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); result in inadequate emergency access; or conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 6 which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant environmental effects related to Transportation and Traffic.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Traffic generated during the construction phase of Project 6 and its gen-tie line would include construction worker commuter trips, water truck trips, and delivery truck trips. Construction worker commuter trips and delivery truck trips are anticipated to arrive to the Project 6 site outside of peak hours. It is anticipated that 30 percent of water trucks would arrive to the Project site during the AM peak hour. Project 6 would have an average of 30 workers per day and a peak of 40 workers per day over a 12-day period during construction. For equipment and materials, Project 6 would have an average of 4 delivery truck trips per day with an expected peak of 26 delivery truck trips. It is anticipated that construction workers and delivery trucks would arrive to the Project 6 site outside of peak hours. **(DEIR at 4.13-37)**.

Dependent upon climatic conditions during construction, the maximum estimated water use for the Project 6 site is 24 acre-feet, which would be obtained from an off-site provider. Potable water would be brought in to the Project 6 site for drinking and domestic needs. During the site preparation and grading activities, water would mainly be used for soil compaction and control of fugitive dust generation. Subsequent to these construction activities, water usage would primarily be used for on-going dust suppression associated with the remaining construction of the Project. Project 6 would require a total of 20 daily water truck trips arriving on-site. Assuming that 30 percent of the water trucks would arrive on-site during the AM peak hour (7:00 AM), 6 water trucks were used in this analysis. As shown in DEIR Tables 4.13-23 and 4.13-24, the local roads would experience a maximum increase in traffic volume of 44.44 percent during the AM peak hour. This is mainly due to the existing low volume and low peak traffic conditions for these roads, which are located in rural areas and operate well below the existing capacity of 1,600 vehicles per lane per hour for a 2-lane road. Therefore, it is concluded that these roads have adequate capacity to safely accommodate the increase from water truck traffic and would have a less than significant impact on the existing traffic conditions. **(DEIR at 4.13-37, 38)**.

During construction of gen-tie lines associated with Project 6, it is anticipated that temporary, one-lane road closures would be necessary. A Project Traffic Plan would be prepared to address the temporary one-lane road closures and submitted to the County for approval prior to issuance/approval of the County Grading Permit, as indicated in Mitigation Measure TT-2.

Parking, temporary office trailers, and construction and PV equipment lay-down areas would be located entirely within the Project 6 site boundary. The construction traffic impacts would be temporary, and less than significant with mitigation. **(DEIR at 4.13-38)**.

The operational phase of Project 6 is anticipated to only generate an average of 2 additional vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hours on a quarterly or as-needed basis with a maximum of 10 additional trips, which would only occur when panel washing operations are being conducted. Based on the traffic analysis for the water truck trips described above, the operational phase vehicle trips are considered negligible. Therefore, no additional post-construction operational analysis was conducted. The Project would not include any buildings, structures, or other operations that would require a change in the existing air traffic patterns. The Project 6 SGF would be connecting to the existing SCEAS via a 3-mile gen-tie line. Transmission line-related radio frequency interference ("RFI") is one of the indirect effects of transmission line operation. RFI is produced by the physical interactions of the electric fields generated by the transmission line. The level of RFI that occurs usually depends on the magnitude of the electric fields involved and the distance from the transmission line. It is usually associated with transmission lines of 345 kV or greater. The Project 6 transmission lines would connect to the SCEAS with a 69 kV gen-tie line (less than 345 kV) and would not adversely impact RFI effects. The operational phase of Project 6 would have a less than significant impact on the traffic and/or transportation infrastructure. **(DEIR at 4.13-38, 39)**. Project 6 would not conflict with any applicable congestion management programs during the construction or operational phases. **(DEIR at 4.13-39)**.

Air traffic would not be impacted by Project 6. Project 6 would not include any buildings, structures, or other operations that would result in a change in existing air traffic patterns. The PV modules that would be used at the Project 6 site would be non-reflective and would not pose a hazard to air traffic. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.13-39)**.

No existing roads would be altered by Project 6, and Project 6 does not include design features or uses that would substantially increase any hazards. Parking, temporary office trailers, and construction and PV equipment lay-down areas would be located entirely within the Project 6 site boundary. Only temporary one-lane road closures are expected for the construction of the gen-tie Lines. A Project Traffic Plan would be prepared to address the temporary one-lane road closures and submitted to the County for approval prior to issuance/approval of the Grading Permit. Therefore, Project 6 would not result in inadequate emergency access. Project 6 is located in rural areas of Los Angeles County and would not significantly decrease the performance or safety of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. **(DEIR at 4.13-40)**.

Project 6 impacts related to Transportation and Traffic are further reduced with the adoption of the following feasible mitigation measures:

TT-1 Prior to issuance of a grading permit, Applicant shall document and submit all required information and/or material pertaining to the pavement conditions of construction routes for the Projects, including the formula for calculation of the Projects' fair share of any repair or reconstruction of construction routes to the satisfaction of LACDPW. Applicant shall reimburse the County of Los Angeles for the cost of any repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes attributable to the Projects as agreed to by

LACDPW. The timing of any necessary repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes and the required payment by the Applicant shall be determined by LACDPW.

TT-2 Prior to any construction activities and/or issuance of required encroachment permits from Los Angeles County, the Applicant shall prepare worksite traffic control plans for review and approval from LACDPW and other affected agencies for any closures, partial closures of public streets, or work within or adjacent to the road right-of-way that impacts the movement of traffic. The Plans shall be prepared in accordance with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (2012).

TT-3 Additionally, the County, including LACFD Fire Stations 78 (for R2011-00801) and 130 (for R2011-000798, 00799, 00805,00807, & 00833) shall be notified at least three days in advance of any street closures that may affect fire and/or paramedic responses in the area. The Applicant shall provide alternate route (detour) plans to the County, including three sets to LACFD, with a tentative schedule of planned closures, prior to the beginning of construction.

TT-4 Stagger construction work shifts before or after peak traffic hours.

TT-5 Schedule truck deliveries during off peak hours.

TT-6 Limit water truck deliveries during the AM peak hour to 30 percent of the daily water truck trips. All other trips shall be at off peak hours.

TT-7 Prior to start of construction activities, Applicant shall provide worker education encouraging carpooling and vanpooling by workers and shall provide assistance for organizing vanpools and carpools. A log will be developed to show compliance.

2.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Potential Effect:

Project 6 would have a significant impact on Utilities and Service Systems if it would: exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards; create water or wastewater system capacity problems, 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; create drainage system capacity problems, 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; not have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses; create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; or create

energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Finding:

Project 6 will not have a significant effect on the environment related to Utilities and Service Systems. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The construction of Project 6 and its associated gen-tie lines would generate temporary and limited wastewater as a result of on-site construction workers. The wastewater generated would be collected at the on-site mobile sanitation facilities and then transported to a nearby wastewater disposal facility. In the event that additional wastewater is generated from construction activities, water would be stored in an on-site tank system and would be disposed of at an approved wastewater treatment facility. Construction and operational wastewater will be limited in quantity and significantly below wastewater treatment requirements of Los Angeles County and the RWQCB. **(DEIR at 4.14-14)**.

All wastewater would be treated according to the treatment requirements enforced by the NPDES permit authorized by the Lahonton Regional Water Quality Control Board ("LRWQCB"). Additionally, semi-annual washing of the PV modules would generate minimal wastewater during operation. However, since the wash water would only consist of demineralized water and dust washed off of the modules, it would not need to be treated at a wastewater treatment facility. This wash water would be allowed to infiltrate into the ground and evaporate as it drips off the PV modules. The wastewater generated from maintenance workers would be collected at the on-site temporary mobile sanitation facilities and then transported to a nearby wastewater treatment facility. Project 6 would not exceed the requirements of LRWQCB, and therefore impacts would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-14)**. Likewise, construction and operation of Project 6 would not exceed the capacity of any treatment plant, and would have no impact to a wastewater system. Consequently, no new wastewater treatment facilities would need to be created and no existing facilities would need to be expanded. The maximum construction water use of Project 6 is 24 acre feet, and the maximum operational water use of Project 6 is 1.0 acre feet per year. No water system capacity problems would be created, and no new water systems or expansion of existing systems would be required. **(DEIR at 4.14-17, 18)**.

Project Site 6 currently drains from northwest to southeast; the post-development condition would maintain this flow path. A SWPPP incorporating BMPs for temporary stormwater management would be prepared and approved before the construction of Project 6 and its gen-tie lines. The final design of Project 6 would allow the pre-development runoff amount to continue to sheet flow in the post-development condition to avoid disturbance to downstream drainage structures or wildlife. The design of Project 6 would eliminate the need for new drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, Project 6 would have a less than significant impact on drainage facilities. **(DEIR at 4.14-19)**.

The construction for Project 6 and the Project 6 gen-tie lines would create a short-term temporary demand for water, primarily in association with dust control. The Applicant would provide a Dust Control Plan to the County prior to the start of construction activities. The plan would detail site-specific dust control measures designed to minimize water use during construction activities, while minimizing fugitive dust emissions. Project 6's maximum construction water use is 24 ac-ft. It is estimated that the Project 6 site would have potentially historically required at least 100 ac-ft of water per year for agriculture. Thus, the maximum construction water use of Project 6 is substantially less than the best estimate of water use of 100 AFY for agriculture, which was historically the primary land use of surrounding land. Based on potential estimated historic groundwater use at the site, there may be adequate groundwater supply within the western portion of the Basin to meet Project 6's construction water needs. In addition, according to the Antelope Valley Integrated Regional Water Management Plan ("IRWMP"), groundwater is considered a reliable water source in the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin. **(DEIR at 4.14-24).**

However, given that the Adjudication will not likely be resolved during construction of Project 6, water for Project 6 would be supplied via truck from either Homer LLC, or the City of Lancaster, both of which have provided "Will Serve" letters indicating their ability to meet the water demands of Project 6. Homer LLC would provide out-of- Basin water stored in the Antelope Valley Water Bank. Potential recycled water providers are Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40, Los Angeles County Sanitation District, and Palmdale Water District. The City of Lancaster has a current supply capacity of approximately 16 million gallons per day of treated wastewater that is suitable for construction use and panel washing. **(Final EIR at p. 256)**.

As previously discussed, the potential estimated historical agricultural water usage for the Project 6 site was determined to be at least 100 AFY. Project 6's maximum construction water use is 24 ac-ft, which equates to 76 percent less than the potential estimated historical annual agricultural groundwater usage at the site. Either of the sources noted above would have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the Project 6 construction demands from existing water source entitlements and water resources. Therefore the impacts from water usage during construction would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-25)**.

During operations, the maximum water use for Project 6 would be 1.0 AFY, which equates to 1 percent of the historical groundwater usage at the site. A maximum of 1.0 AFY of additional water may be needed in the first 2 years of operation to establish the plants for the landscaping buffer. It is unlikely, but possible that additional water (up to 1.0 AFY) may be needed later during the operations phase for supplemental plantings if landscape vegetation expires and has to be replaced. **(DEIR at 4.14-25)**. As with the Project 6 water needs during construction, during operations Homer LLC would also provide out-of-Basin water stored in the Antelope Valley Water Bank. This option would provide a reliable source of water for operations. Potential recycled water providers are Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, Los Angeles County Waterworks District 40, Los Angeles County Sanitation District, and Palmdale Water District. The City of Lancaster has a current supply capacity of approximately 16 million gallons per day of treated wastewater that is suitable for construction use and panel washing. **(Final EIR at p. 256)**.

Therefore, the impacts from water usage during operations would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-25)**.

Project 6 and its associated gen-tie lines do not require natural gas or propane during construction or operation; therefore there would be no system capacity problems for those utilities. Since natural gas and propane are not needed for Project 6, no new energy facilities would need to be created, and no existing facilities would need to be expanded. Project 6 may require electricity for the construction equipment and for lighting construction activities. The electricity would likely come from one of the existing SCE lines located on the west and south sides of the site. Electricity consumption during construction would be temporary, and would vary depending on the phase of construction. Overall, the construction of Project 6 would require limited electrical consumption that the existing electrical grid has capacity to serve. Therefore, Project 6 would have a less than significant impact on energy utility system capacity during construction. **(DEIR at 4.14-25)**.

Project 6 would also require electricity for ongoing maintenance operations, lighting, security systems, and other various operational needs. During daylight hours, the electricity needs for Project 6 would be supplied by Project 6's electricity generation. During non-daylight hours, the electricity needs for Project 6 would be provided by either backfeed from the electrical grid, through the proposed gen-tie, or through the existing SCE lines located on the west and south sides of the Project 6 site. Therefore, Project 6 would have a less than significant impact on energy utility system capacity. **(DEIR at 4.14-26)**.

Construction of Project 6 would require minimal ground disturbance during the facility installation. Solid waste generated from construction of Project 6 (and gentie lines) may include paper, wood, glass, plastics from packing material, waste lumber, insulation, scrap metal and concrete, empty non-hazardous containers, and vegetation wastes. In accordance with Title 22 Chapter 22.52, 65 percent of construction and demolition debris would be recycled. Any material that cannot be recycled would be properly disposed of at a regional disposal facility. Any defective or broken solar modules would be returned to the manufacturer for recycling. In accordance with Title 22 Chapter 20.87, the Applicant would prepare a Recycling and Reuse Plan and progress reports to implement and document the Project's recycling practices. Therefore, Project 6 impacts on landfill and solid waste disposal capacity would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.14-26)**. Once the SGF is installed, there would be minimal waste generated during Project 6 operations; therefore Project 6 will have a less than significant impact on landfill and solid waste disposal capacity during operations. **(DEIR at 4.14-27)**.

Non-hazardous waste generated during construction, operation, and decommissioning of Project 6 (and gen-tie lines) would be transferred by licensed waste hauling contractors and recycled or disposed of in compliance with local and state regulations. Hazardous wastes would be shipped offsite and treated or disposed in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations for hazardous waste management. The construction contractor would prepare a Project-specific hazardous materials management and hazardous waste management program for Project 6. Project 6 would have no impact relative to compliance with existing federal or state regulations pertaining to solid waste, because Project 6 would be required to comply with all relevant regulations during construction, operation and decommissioning. **(DEIR at 4.14-27)**.

SECTION 3.0 FINDINGS REGARDING CUMULATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH ARE NOT SIGNIFICANT OR WHICH HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

Pursuant to Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines, the following findings and statements of fact identify potentially significant cumulative impacts and Project 6's incremental contribution to the impacts discussed in the Final EIR, in the context of the other five Projects and other cumulative projects. For the following environmental resource areas, Project 6's incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable, and no cumulatively significant impact will occur.

3.1 AESTHETICS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 6), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Aesthetics.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 6, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects. Project 6, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Aesthetics.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Individually, with mitigation, each of the six proposed SGF Projects can each be expected to have a less than significant impact on aesthetic resources. The Project sites comprise 987.1 acres, or 0.6 percent of the total area within the 5 mile radius. Within the 5-mile radius area, there are 20,909 acres of development listed by individual projects, as shown in DEIR Table 3-7. These development projects, including the Applicant's Projects, comprise 12.6 percent of the area identified in DEIR Figure 3-5 and include solar projects, commercial projects, and residential projects.

From elevated viewpoints, the western Antelope Valley appears as a mosaic of agricultural lands, suburban developments, and open land. From a distance, the proposed SGFs would not appear dissimilar to agricultural fields or existing PV facilities in shape and size. The other solar and real estate developments proposed for the western Antelope Valley would not appear dissimilar to existing land use patterns. From level viewpoints, such as those along local roads, solar or residential/commercial developments would not be prominent unless the observer is directly adjacent to the facility. Because of the flat nature of the Antelope Valley landscape, developments would quickly become less prominent as the viewer travels away from them. In addition, the scenic character on the valley floor is generally low. Existing commercial, residential, and energy developments (including substations, high-voltage transmission lines, distribution lines, and generation facilities) are scattered throughout the valley.

A 12.6 percent level of increase in development within 5 miles of each of the Project sites is not anticipated to be significant from elevated or level viewpoints, because the proposed developments would appear similar to existing developments in the Antelope Valley, and cover only a very small portion of the land within 5 miles of each proposed Project site. Views of open desert lands would still exist, and the flatness of the landscape would limit the prominence of new developments with increasing distance.

The proposed Projects and other proposed projects within the cumulative impacts study area would be individually required to comply with the Los Angeles County General Plan goals and policies, and the Antelope Valley Area Plan policies, as well as applicable ordinances such as the Los Angeles County Rural Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance, as they are applicable to aesthetic resources, as identified in Section 4.1.3 of the DEIR. Any cumulative aesthetic impacts would be reduced to a level that is less than significant with mitigation by application of these regulations, and mitigation measures A-1 to A-5. **(DEIR at 4.1-114 to 4.1-115)**.

3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Cumulative impacts to Agriculture and Forestry Resources could occur in the event that Project 6, in conjunction with the six proposed SGF Projects and other cumulative projects results in the area results in a cumulatively significant loss of Important Farmlands or Williamson Act contracted lands.

Finding:

Project 6, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Agriculture and Forestry Resources. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see DEIR Table 3-7). For the purposes of this cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable law ordinances regulations and standards.

Projects 1 – 6 are located in a region with significant agricultural uses. However, the Antelope Valley has been historically and is currently limited by water costs and climate conditions. Cumulatively, the Projects would not develop land classified as Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Project 4 is the only site that currently contains land designated as Prime Farmland and of Statewide Importance. As mentioned above, the DOC is in process of reclassifying Project 4 land currently mapped as Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance to Grazing Land on the 2012 edition of the Important Farmland Map for Los Angeles County. The Projects would not be expected to contribute to the overall trend of conversion of agricultural lands to other uses in the Antelope Valley when considered together with other

potential cumulative projects in the area. That said, it is contemplated that at the end of the anticipated 35-year life of Projects 1-6, the associated properties could be returned to agricultural use. The Projects' incremental contribution to cumulative agricultural impacts is considered less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.2-9)**.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 6), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Air Quality.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 6, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Air Quality. Project 6, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Air Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Twenty-nine related projects have been identified within the proposed Projects' vicinity; locations are listed in DEIR Figure 4.3-2, "Cumulative Projects in the Region". Of these 29 related projects, there are a number of related projects that have not yet been built or are currently under construction. Since the Applicant has no control over the timing or sequencing of the related projects, and the level of emissions that would be generated by the related projects is uncertain, it is infeasible and speculative to prepare a quantitative analysis to ascertain daily construction emissions that would occur under a worst-case scenario of all 29 related projects being constructed concurrently with the Applicant's six Projects.

For this reason, the AVAQMD was consulted to assess the cumulative impact resulting only from the Applicant's six Projects. The County's EIR consultant (Tetra Tech) met with AVAQMD officials and technical staff at the AVAQMD's office on May 29, 2012, and discussed the proper cumulative Air Quality analysis methodology for the Project pursuant to CEQA. **(DEIR at 4.3-48)**. AVAQMD determined that cumulative impacts from the Applicant's six Projects should be cumulatively quantified based on size, construction equipment per phase, and construction phase duration, and that the related projects should only be qualitatively discussed within the EIR. The cumulative Air Quality analysis was performed based on the direction from AVAQMD, and included the analysis of concurrent construction and operation emissions sources on any one maximum construction day, air dispersion modeling method, and risk assessment method. **(DEIR at 4.3-48)**.

As previously discussed in the analyses above (DEIR Table 4.3-13, "Peak Annual Construction Emissions"; DEIR Table 4.3-20, "Peak Annual Operation Emissions"; and DEIR Table 4.3-22, "Concurrent Health Risk Assessment"), emissions from overlapping construction phases of the

Applicant's six projects would not exceed the AVAQMD thresholds on any maximum day or year during construction or operations. **(DEIR 4.3-30; 4.3-49)**.

With respect to the Project's construction-period air quality emissions and cumulative Basin-wide conditions, the AVAQMD has developed strategies to reduce criteria pollutant emissions outlined in the Air Quality Management Plan ("AQMP") pursuant to CAA mandates. As such, Project 6 would comply with AVAQMD Rule 403 requirements, and implement all feasible mitigation measures. In addition, Project 6 would comply with adopted AQMP emissions control measures. Per AVAQMD rules and mandates and the CEQA requirement that significant impacts be mitigated to the extent feasible, these same requirements (i.e., Rule 403 compliance, the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, and compliance with adopted AQMP emissions control measures) would also be imposed on construction projects Basin-wide, which would include each of the related projects mentioned below. **(DEIR 4.3-49)**.

By applying AVAQMD's cumulative air quality impact methodology, implementation of Projects 1 – 6 would not result in an addition of pollutants, such that considerable cumulative impacts in conjunction with related projects in the region would occur. Therefore, the emissions of nonattainment pollutants and precursors generated cumulatively by Projects 1 – 6 would be less than significant. Projects are deemed inconsistent with air quality plans when they result in population and/or employment growth that exceeds growth estimates in the applicable air quality plan. The SGF sites would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, which in this case is the Federal 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan (Western Mojave Desert Nonattainment Area). The Ozone Attainment Plan relies upon future year emission inventories consistent with California Air Resource Board ("CARB") and the adopted General Plan growth projections. As the proposed Projects are not part of an ongoing regulatory program, the AVAQMD recommends Project-specific air quality impacts be used to determine the potential cumulative impacts to regional air quality. As discussed above, peak daily emissions of operation-related pollutants would not exceed AVAQMD significance thresholds.

The combined Projects' emission estimates state that while Projects 1 – 6 would generate air emissions during construction and a minimal amount of GHG emissions during operations, the Projects' incremental contribution, with mitigation, to cumulative air quality impacts do not exceed any air quality significance thresholds and would comply with the applicable AVAQMD AQMP. It should be noted that solar energy provided by the Projects is a much cleaner source of energy than traditional sources used for the generation of electricity, such as the burning of coal, fuel oil, or natural gas. Furthermore, since the percentage of GHG emissions generated by Projects 1 – 6 is so small; Projects 1 – 6 would provide a *de minimis* contribution to significant cumulative impacts caused by other projects in the region (as further discussed in DEIR Section 4.7, Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas). The Projects' emissions of non-attainment pollutants and precursors generated during operations with mitigation would not exceed the AVAQMD Project-level thresholds and are less than significant. As a result, Project-level emissions would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution, such that results in an increase in air pollutant emissions above those assumed in the regional AQMP. **(DEIR at 4.3-52)**.

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 6), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Biological Resources.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 6, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Biological Resources. Project 6, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Biological Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The total area included in the map in DEIR Figure 3-17 showing a 5.0 mile radius outward from each of the Project 1 – 6 solar sites comprises 165,349 acres. Solar development in the area is 8,086 acres (4.9 percent of the 165,349 acres shown in DEIR Figure 3-17). The Silverado Projects cover 987 acres (only 0.6 percent of the total area). Open space and wildlife mitigation lands would be acquired and preserved in perpetuity for Projects 1 – 6. Since the mitigation lands are intended to comprise higher quality wildlife habitat than those impacted by the Projects, impacts will be mitigated. The permanent nature of the land mitigation and preservation program to be implemented would assure that these new wildlife habitat mitigation lands would always be maintained and enhanced for wildlife values. Therefore, cumulative impacts from the Project would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.4-71)**.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 6), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Cultural Resources.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 6, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Cultural Resources. Project 6, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Cultural Resources.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. As described above under impacts specific to Project 6, impacts related to cultural resources would be mitigated to less than significant levels, since the CRHR eligible resources in the area would be avoided. Because impacts to cultural resources would be mitigated to less than significant through avoidance, Projects 1 – 6 would not result in an incremental increase in effects on cultural resources when combined with the other 29 projects. Therefore, no significant cumulative impacts would be expected to occur. **(DEIR at 4.5-35)**.

3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 6), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Geology and Soils.

Finding:

Project 6, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Geology and Soils. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). For the purposes of this cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time.

It is assumed that construction of all of the cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards, and that geotechnical studies would be performed to assess and mitigate any geotechnical hazards associated with them; therefore, the cumulative projects would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects. It is also assumed that the cumulative projects would comply with all applicable erosion control and stormwater management laws, ordinances, regulations and standards, therefore the construction of the cumulative projects would not contribute to cumulative soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

Proposed Projects 1 – 6 would not expose the public to adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking because the Projects would be contained within a secure fenced area at each location and not open to the public. The potential for injury to workers is also quite low as they will not be on-site the majority of the time, and the likelihood that a seismic event would occur

when workers are present is quite small. The Projects would also not result in significant soil erosion because the design and construction of the Projects' facilities would comply with all applicable building codes and standards established by regulatory agencies, including Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and the CBC. The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would therefore not contribute incrementally to cumulative impacts resulting from other development within the 5-mile radius. **(DEIR at 4.6-27)**.

3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 6), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 6, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change. Project 6, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15355, a "cumulative impact" is an environmental effect that may result from the combination of two or more environmental effects associated with a proposed project, or from the combination of one or more project environmental effects with related environmental effects caused by other closely related projects. However, in the case of global climate change, the proximity of the Projects to other GHG-generating activities is not directly relevant to the determination of a cumulative impact. Although AB 32 sets statewide targets for future GHG emissions, the scoping plan and other implementing tools of the law are clear that the reductions are not expected to occur uniformly from all sources or sectors. The conclusions related specifically to Project 6, above, highlights the manner by which the proposed Projects intend to meet many of these strategies.

Numerous options exist for project developers to reduce their contribution to city-, county-, and state-wide GHG emissions, while helping to meet the region's future housing, jobs, and infrastructure needs. However, it is not possible at this time to accurately quantify GHG emissions expected from the related Projects or the GHG reductions anticipated from the above-listed strategies. There is no certain basis for concluding that an emissions increase resulting from the Projects and the related Projects could cause a measurable increase in global GHG emissions sufficient to force global climate change due to the complex physical, chemical and atmospheric mechanisms involved in global climate change.

In addition, the emissions models used for Project-level evaluations do not fully reflect improvements in technology and other reductions in GHG emissions that are likely to occur

pursuant to state regulations, such as AB 1493, SB 1368, AB 32, and Executive Order S-3-5, as well as future federal and/or state regulations. Therefore, it is not possible or meaningful to calculate emissions from each of the identified related Projects and compare that with a numeric threshold or reduction target. Projects 1-6 would be consistent with the state's goals in helping the state meet the RPS (DEIR Table 4.7-17), resulting in a GHG emission profile that is below established thresholds, and include implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-1 to GHG-5. Therefore, the Projects do not contribute considerably to cumulatively significant global climate change impacts. **(DEIR at 4.7-31)**.

3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 6), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 6, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Project 6, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see Table 3-7). For the purposes of this cumulative analysis, the worst case scenario is assumed, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. It is assumed that for each of the cumulative projects, Hazardous Materials Management Plans and Hazardous Waste Management Plans would be implemented, a SWPPP would be prepared, and all applicable environmental due diligence would be conducted (i.e., a Phase I ESA). If any of the cumulative projects are within an airport land use plan or airport influence area, the projects would obtain the appropriate authorizations and permitting from the respective Airport Land Use Commission. The cumulative projects would have a less than significant impact with mitigation to hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the land uses in the surrounding areas (primarily agricultural) and the limited amount and type of hazardous materials to be used as part of the proposed Projects 1 – 6, no significant incremental cumulative impacts associated with environmental safety are expected to occur as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed Projects 1 – 6. Regulations implemented by the Department of Toxic Substance Control ("DTSC"), LACSD, LACFD, and Cal/OSHA would require similar measures be applied to other developments in the region. Therefore,

Projects 1 – 6 are not expected to result in significant incremental cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. **(DEIR at 4.8-19 to 4.8-20)**.

3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 6), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 6, which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects to Hydrology and Water Quality. Project 6, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Project sites, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-3). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws ordinances regulations and standards. Projects located within 5 miles of the proposed Projects entail the geographic extent under consideration of cumulative impacts. The proposed Projects are six of several proposed renewable development projects that would impact existing and proposed land uses within the general Project area. As shown in DEIR Table 3-7 and DEIR Figure 3-17, the proposed Projects would entail approximately 0.60 percent of all proposed projects within a 5-mile radius.

All cumulative projects that may be approved and implemented would also assess potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality. The proposed Projects 1 – 6 were found to have less than significant impacts related to erosion, flooding, debris deposition, and stormwater quality, with no off-site impacts. Additionally, the proposed Projects would not result in any significant or unavoidable impacts and represent a small fraction of the total amount of lands affected by renewable projects and foreseeable projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects. Therefore, the proposed Projects would not be expected to significantly contribute to potential cumulative impacts associated with other projects in the Projects' region. **(DEIR at 4.9-45)**.

3.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 6), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Land Use and Planning.

Finding:

Project 6, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Land Use and Planning. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6. The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards. **(DEIR at 4.10-43)**.

Projects located within 5 miles of the proposed Projects entail the geographic extent under consideration of cumulative impacts. The proposed Projects are six of several proposed renewable development projects that would impact existing and proposed land uses within the general Project area. Similar potential impacts can result from these projects as from the Projects with respect to consistency with the subject general plan land use plans and policies, impacts to compatibility with surrounding land uses, and regulatory compliance with zoning ordinances. All cumulative projects that may be approved and implemented would also assess potential impacts related to land use and planning. The proposed Projects were found to have less than significant impacts related to compliance with County zoning, consistency with the County General Plan Land Use Plan intent and applicable land use conformance criteria, dividing an existing community, and with no significant impacts to the adjacent City of Lancaster. Additionally, the proposed Projects would not result in any significant or unavoidable land use impacts and represent a small fraction of the total amount of lands affected by renewable projects and foreseeable projects within a 5 mile radius of the Projects. Therefore, the proposed Projects would not be expected to significantly contribute to potential cumulative land use related impacts associated with other projects in the region. **(DEIR at 4.10-44)**.

3.11 NOISE

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 6), have the potential to result in cumulative Noise impacts.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 6, which mitigate or avoid significant Noise impacts. Project 6, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant Noise impact.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Two non-Applicant projects identified have the potential to result in cumulative construction noise impacts, due to the projects being located in relatively close proximity to the proposed Projects, but not close enough to result in vibration impacts. The Western Antelope Dry Ranch project (CUP 11-07) is located approximately 1-mile north of Project 2, and the High Desert LLC (CUP 10-03) project is located approximately 1-mile north of Project 4. These distances are close enough that construction noise could propagate out to distances near the Applicant's Projects, but are not close enough to potentially result in vibration impacts. The time period of construction for these two projects is unknown, but if construction were to overlap with construction of the proposed Projects, there is the potential for increased temporary noise levels at residences; however, none of the noise sensitive receptors that are located in close proximity to Project 4 are also located in close proximity to Antelope Solar 1 or Antelope Solar Farm projects. Therefore, sound levels from construction of the Projects would only be minimally increased (less than 1-2 dBA), or not at all, by simultaneous construction. Therefore, overall cumulative impacts of the proposed Projects 1 – 6 would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures N-1 to N-9. **(DEIR at 4.11-56)**.

3.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 6), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Public Services.

Finding:

Project 6, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Public Services. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Projects amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (see DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards. It is assumed that for each of the cumulative projects,

worksite traffic control plans, permits, and coordination with County departments regarding potential construction impacts would be implemented. **(DEIR at 4.12-16)**.

Projects 1 – 6 would not cause effects to result in significant demands to fire response times. Projects 1 – 6 would be designed with appropriate fire protection considerations, and would also result in less than significant impacts to staffing and response times. Furthermore, Projects 1 – 6 would be required to provide taxes to the County that are designed to address cumulative fire department needs associated with new and existing developments. Other developments in the vicinity of Projects 1 – 6 would also be required to pay taxes and fees to the County to provide for their potential increase to LACFD fire protection service demands (LACFD 2009). Additionally, all development in the area is subject to review and approval by the Fire Department. This ensures that all projects contain appropriate controls to reduce demand on the fire department. As a result, Projects 1 – 6 would be anticipated to result in less than significant incremental contributions to cumulative fire protection impacts. **(DEIR at 4.12-17)**.

Projects 1 – 6 would not cause effects to result in significant demands to sheriff staffing or response times. Projects 1 – 6 would also implement site security control, including 24-hour remotely monitored video cameras for security monitoring to prevent potential theft and vandalism activities. Additionally, a portion of Projects 1 – 6 taxes levied would be allocated to sheriff services. Other developments in the vicinity of Projects 1 – 6 would also be required to pay taxes that would be allocated to sheriff services. As a result, construction and operation of Projects 1 – 6 would be anticipated to result in less than significant incremental contributions to cumulative sheriff protection impacts. Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with sheriff services would be less than significant. **(DEIR at 4.12-17)**.

Because development of Projects 1-6 will not induce population growth, no direct or cumulative impacts to schools, parks, libraries or other public facilities will occur. **(DEIR at 4.12-15; 4.12-16)**.

3.13 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 6), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Transportation and Traffic.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into Project 6, which mitigate or avoid significant impacts to Transportation and Traffic. Project 6, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Transportation and Traffic.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Cumulative impacts for transportation and traffic are the combined effect of Projects 1 – 6 with the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects (other projects). This Cumulative Impacts discussion addresses the cumulative impacts of the Applicant's Projects 1 – 6 and the other projects within a geographic radius of 5-mile radius of the Projects (Project Study Area), which could potentially coincide with the expected construction schedule of the Applicant's Projects. Based on evaluation of the Project Study Area and available data from Los Angeles County, there are 29 other projects that have the potential to contribute additional traffic volume within the vicinity of Projects 1-6.

Evaluation of the cumulative impacts within the Project Study Area was focused on the construction-phase traffic for Projects 1-6 and other projects within a 5-mile radius. As previously stated in the individual conclusions for Project 6 above, the operational phase for each Project is anticipated to only generate a maximum of 4 vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hours on a quarterly or as-needed basis with a maximum of 12 additional trips, which would only occur when panel washing operations are being conducted. Based on the traffic analysis contained in the DEIR, the operational phase vehicle trips/traffic for the Projects are considered negligible and would not result in a significant cumulative impact on the traffic and/or transportation infrastructure in the Project Study Area. **(DEIR at 4.13-41 to 4.13-43)**.

3.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Potential Effect:

Other land development projects proposed or under construction in the area, in combination with the six proposed SGF Projects (including Project 6), have the potential to result in cumulative impacts to Utilities and Service Systems.

Finding:

Project 6, in conjunction with other development projects, will not result in a cumulatively significant impact to Utilities and Service Systems. No mitigation is required.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

There are 29 cumulative projects within a 5-mile radius of the Projects, amounting to 20,909 acres of development including Projects 1 – 6 (DEIR Table 3-7). The cumulative analysis assumed a worst-case scenario, i.e., all cumulative projects would be constructed at the same time. It is also assumed that all cumulative projects would comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, and regulations. Construction and operation of the cumulative projects would result in less than significant impacts to public facilities, which include electricity, gas, wastewater, and solid waste services. During construction, all cumulative projects would follow required measures to prevent construction interference to utility services, and would comply with recycling requirements to minimize solid waste disposal at solid waste facilities. During operation, the solar and wind generation projects would provide electricity, and would generate

minimal amounts of solid waste. During operation, the non-solar/non-wind commercial and residential development projects would generate solid waste as would be expected from these residential and commercial uses; it is assumed that these project proponents have planned for and mitigated for the additional solid waste generation as appropriate.

The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would provide their own electricity for operational needs, no natural gas would be required for their operations, little wastewater (from panel washing) would be generated as part of the operations process, and very little solid waste would be generated. As a result, the total cumulative impacts to utility services would be less than significant, and the incremental contribution of Projects 1 – 6 to cumulative impacts related to utility services would be less than significant. Furthermore, because the Applicant has committed to using out of Basin water during construction and operations, Projects 1 – 6 would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to water supply impacts in the Basin, and would have no significant cumulative effect on water supply. **(DEIR at 4.14-28)**.

SECTION 4.0 FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

These Findings and Statements of Fact regarding project alternatives and certain mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR are set forth to comply with Section 21002 of the Public Resources Code and Sections 15091(a)(3) and 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines. Five alternatives to the proposed Project (consisting of Projects 1-6) described in the Draft EIR were analyzed and considered as follows: 1) No Project Alternative; 2) Lower Intensity Projects; 3) Select Other Project Sites Alternative; 4) Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative; and 5) Wind Energy Generation Alternative. These alternatives constitute a reasonable range of alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. For the reasons set forth below, Alternatives 1-5 are rejected as infeasible for the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations set forth below.

4.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Description:

Under the No Project Alternative, Project sites 1-6 would remain in their present condition with site conditions (i.e., fallow agricultural land) as they currently exist.

Finding:

The No Project Alternative is rejected as infeasible because it fails to meet the Project goals and objectives, and would not contribute to the State's ability to meet its near- and long-term renewable energy generation goals and objectives.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

The proposed Projects 1 – 6 would not be approved or implemented under the No Project Alternative. The potential environmental impacts and benefits of the proposed Projects would not occur as a direct consequence of implementation under the No Project Alternative. The No Project Alternative would involve taking no action to generate 172 MW of clean, renewable electrical power utilizing solar PV technology and to integrate the electrical output of the

Projects into the electrical grid. This alternative would not allow one of the primary purposes of the proposed Projects which is to increase the output of renewable energy in support of the RPS, such that the State of California may meet its current and planned goals for increasing renewable generation at reasonable market rates.

The No Project Alternative assumes that the sites will remain as they currently exist (primarily fallow agricultural land) and no environmental impacts would result. In summary, the No Project Alternative is provided for comparative purposes to the proposed Projects 1 – 6. This alternative is incapable of meeting the stated goals and objectives of the Projects to provide 172 MW of renewable electric energy to utility providers, and does not contribute to the state's ability to meet its near-term and long-term renewable energy generation goals and objectives. **(DEIR 5-1 to 5-2)**.

4.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: LOWER INTENSITY PROJECTS

Description:

Under the Lower Intensity Projects Alternative, fewer than six sites would be developed, and the smaller projects would be developed in a size and configuration that would result in generation of fewer than 172 MW of electricity.

Finding:

The Lower Intensity Projects Alternative is rejected as infeasible because it partially fails to accomplish the goals of the proposed Projects, which are to provide 172 MW of clean, renewable electric energy using solar PV technology, and to deliver the electric output on a wholesale basis to utility providers.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

Projects 1-6 are designed to meet the increasing demand for clean, renewable electrical power. Any reduction in the size of the effort results in a similar potential reduction in the reliance on foreign sources of fuel, the diversification of energy portfolios, the contribution to the reduction of GHG emissions, and the generation of "green" jobs. It would also potentially reduce the contribution to the much needed on-peak power to the electrical grid in California.

The opportunity to develop solar power in Los Angeles County has a limited timeframe because the utility companies, which purchase the power, would purchase power from another entity if the proposed Projects are not completed in a timely manner. If Los Angeles County does not approve the six viable SGFs proposed here, the opportunity to contribute to the competitive solar generation business in the County will be further lost to other projects. The proposed Projects are well-positioned to compete in the industry, are comparatively environmentally superior to most other locations, and have good positions for PPAs and interconnection agreements. Additionally, any reduction of the megawatts produced from these Projects would further limit the County's contribution to the State's renewable energy production goals. These 5 to 52 MW Projects meet

the utility industry needs for small projects, and any reduction of the respective Projects' size would jeopardize the success of the Projects. **(DEIR at 5-2)**.

4.3 ALTERNATIVE 3: SELECT OTHER PROJECT SITES ALTERNATIVE

Description:

Under the Select Other Project Sites Alternative, other properties could potentially be used for the six Project sites.

Finding:

The Select Other Project Sites Alternative is rejected, because this alternative would have the same or greater impacts to the environment as Projects 1-6, which can all be mitigated to below a level of significance.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

One key objective for the Project Applicant was to locate the Projects in an area with the following characteristics: (1) adequate solar radiation; (2) close proximity to interconnection locations for each solar site; (3) project sites with landowners who are willing to sell large enough parcels of land for solar generation at market price; (4) lack of threatened and/or endangered biological species on the site; (5) lack of nearby sensitive receptors or land uses to minimize potential conflicts with development (6) relatively flat sites that have previously been disturbed to minimize disturbance to native habitat and to minimize the need for site grading; (7) existing access to accommodate construction workforce needs; and (8) access to nearby workforce to minimize traffic and socioeconomic impacts. The Applicant performed in-depth analyses of over 10,000 acres of land in the Western Antelope Valley, as shown in DEIR Figure 6-1. Of the 10,000 acres screened, only ten percent met the criteria listed above.

The six Project sites selected and proposed by the Applicant are the most viable sites to develop solar electricity generation with minimal environmental impacts. These sites were also chosen for development based on interconnection capacity and requirements placed on the Applicant by the utility providers. Selection of other alternative sites would have the same or greater impacts to the environment since the present Projects are the result of a long and intense effort by the Applicant to find and acquire the most suitable sites according to the criteria given above. **(DEIR at 1-6; 5-3)**. Furthermore, the environmental impacts for Projects 1-6 can all be mitigated to below a level of significance.

4.4 ALTERNATIVE 4: ROOFTOP SOLAR GENERATION

Description:

Under the Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative, solar photovoltaic panels would be installed on private rooftops.

Finding:

The Rooftop Solar Generation Alternative is rejected as infeasible, because the Project Applicant does not have the ability to install solar panels on private rooftops.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

For rooftop solar to be a viable alternative to the proposed Projects it would need to provide 172 MW of electricity into the local grid. Assuming one residential installation can produce 25 kilowatts of electricity, a total of 6,880 residential installations would be needed to produce 172 MW of electricity. The Applicant does not have the ability to install solar panels on private rooftops; therefore this alternative is not feasible for the Applicant. **(DEIR at 5-3)**.

4.5 ALTERNATIVE 5: WIND ENERGY GENERATION

Description:

Under the Wind Energy Generation Alternative, electricity would be generated through the use of wind turbines.

Finding:

The Wind Energy Generation Alternative is rejected as infeasible, because the type of geographical location that is suitable for a wind farm is not available within the vicinity.

Facts Supporting the Finding:

For wind energy generation to be a reasonable alternative to the proposed Projects and meet the purpose and need of the proposed Projects, it would need to provide 172 MW of electricity into the local grid; and to be sited on previously disturbed land that utilizes existing electrical distribution facilities, ROWs, roads, and other existing infrastructure where feasible to minimize the need for new electrical support facilities. The area required for construction and operation of a 172 MW wind farm would require a much more specific type of geographical location than the Projects to provide adequate wind; a feasible project area of the nature required for wind electricity production is not readily available within the area of analysis for the proposed Projects. For this reason, this alternative is infeasible. **(DEIR at 5-3)**.

SECTION 5.0 FINDINDS REGARDING THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM ("MMRP")

Pursuant to Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code, the Commission, in adopting these Findings, also adopts the MMRP for the Silverado Power West Los Angeles Project. This Program is designed to ensure that, during Project implementation, the County and other responsible parties will comply with the mitigation measures adopted in these Findings.

The Commission hereby finds that the MMRP, which is incorporated herein by reference and attached as Exhibit A to these Findings, meets the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 by providing for the implementation and monitoring of Project conditions intended to mitigate potential environmental effects of the Project.

SECTION 6.0 CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15091 AND 15092 FINDINGS

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the administrative record, the Commission has made one or more of the following findings with respect to each of the significant effects of the Project:

A. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects on the environment.

B. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and such changes have been adopted by such other agency, or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the administrative record, and as conditioned by the foregoing:

A. All significant effects on the environment due to the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible.

SECTION 7.0 CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15084(D)(3) AND 15084(D)(4) FINDINGS

The County has relied on Sections 15084(d)(3) of the State CEQA guidelines, which allow acceptance of working drafts prepared by the Applicant, a consultant retained by the Applicant, or any other person. The County has also relied upon Section 15084(d)(4), which allows the Draft EIR to be prepared directly by, or under contract by the lead agency. The County has reviewed and edited as necessary the submitted drafts to reflect the County's own independent judgment, including reliance on County technical personnel from other departments.

SECTION 8.0 PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21082.1(C) FINDINGS

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(c), the Commission hereby finds that the lead agency has independently reviewed and analyzed the Final EIR, and that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency.

SECTION 9.0 NATURE OF FINDINGS

Any finding made by this Commission shall be deemed made, regardless of where it appears in this document. All of the language included in this document constitutes findings by this Commission, whether or not any particular sentence or clause includes a statement to that effect. This Commission intends that these Findings be considered as an integrated whole and, whether

or not any part of these Findings fail to cross reference or incorporate by reference any other part of these findings, that any finding required or committed to be made by this Commission with respect to any particular subject matter of the Final EIR, shall be deemed to be made if it appears in any portion of these Findings.

SECTION 10.0 RELIANCE ON RECORD

Each and all of the findings and determinations contained herein are based on the competent and substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the entire administrative record relating to the Silverado Power West Los Angeles County Project. The findings and determinations constitute the independent findings and determinations of this Commission in all respects, and are fully and completely supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.

SECTION 11.0 RELATIONSHIP OF FINDINGS TO EIR

The County finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the EIR or is in the record of proceedings in the matter.

SECTION 12.0 CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS

The custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the County's decision is based is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning located at 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012.

EXHIBIT A
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
(“MMRP”)

CEQA requires a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for projects where mitigation measures are a condition of project approval and development. The Draft EIR prepared for the Silverado Power West, Los Angeles County Projects identified mitigation measures, where appropriate, to avoid or substantially reduce the environmental impacts associated with the Project. This MMRP is designed to monitor the implementation of those mitigation measures. Accordingly, this MMRP has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15097.

This section lists each of the proposed Project Design Features (PDFs) and required Mitigation Measures (MMs) and identifies the corresponding action required for proof of compliance, the mitigation timing, the party responsible for implementation, and the monitoring agency or party responsible for ensuring each measure is adequately implemented.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Silverado Power West, Los Angeles County Projects
Project Nos. R2011-00833, 00798, 00799, 00807, 00801, 00805
March 2014

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.1 AESTHETICS				
A-1 A Fugitive Dust Control Plan to minimize dust (visual pollution) shall be prepared and implemented.	A. Submit Plan to AVAQMD for review and approval	Prior to any ground disturbance activities	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP AVAQMD
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD
A-2 The Project site shall be maintained free of debris, trash, and waste during construction.	Site inspection	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP
A-3 The Project site shall be visually screened or partially screened during construction by fencing.	A. Submit Site Plans for review and approval	Prior to issuance of applicable building permit	Applicant	LACDRP
	B. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP
A-4 A landscape plan shall be developed for each Project prior to Project construction that shows the detail of a 10-foot wide screening vegetation buffer intended to screen or partially screen the Project visually from area residents or travelers on nearby roadways.	A. Submit landscape plan for review and approval. The landscape plan must be approved prior to grading or building permit.	Prior to 1st grading or building permit whichever comes first for each project.	Applicant	LACDRP/LACFD – support/referral Approval of landscape plan
	B. Implement approved landscape plan	Prior to first energization approval by LADPW B & S	Applicant	LACDRP/LACFD – support/referral Approval of landscape plan
A-5 All lighting shall comply with applicable provisions of the Los Angeles County Outdoor Lighting District Ordinance. Lights shall be limited to types allowed by the ordinance, installed below maximum allowed heights, pointed downwards and shielded to minimize light trespass, and mounted on essential infrastructure rather than on separate light poles	Submit final lighting plan for review and approval	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
except where poles are required by regulation or by governing agency. Lighting will comply with the hours of operation requirements in the ordinance, and utilize automatic control devices to comply with time limits except where permitted by Los Angeles County. Lighting will be maintained in good repair at all times.				
5.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY				
No mitigation measures are required for Agriculture and Forestry.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.3 AIR QUALITY				
AQ-1 Water active sites at least twice daily (locations where soil disturbance is to occur would be thoroughly watered before earthmoving) during construction.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVQMD
AQ-2 All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of CVC Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-3 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-4 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not be idle more than five minutes in any one hour.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-5 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have documented training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operation of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-6 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be maintained at 15 mph or less.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-7 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.	Submit Transportation Demand Management program for review and approval	Prior to issuance of building permits	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPW support and referral for trip reduction determination

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
AQ-8 During array area preparation, mowing shall be used instead of grading and/or disking, and shall be limited to no more than 3.5 acres per day per site to further reduce dust emissions during construction.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-9 All interior roads shall use long-lasting non-toxic chemical soil stabilizers designed for long-term dust stabilization on dirt roads.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
AQ-10 Interior array areas shall have re-established pre-existing vegetation or be established with drought tolerant, native, or native compatible vegetation, to the greatest extent feasible, approved by the County biologist and compliant with Fire Department requirements, within two years of energization authorization of an array area by the Department of Public Works, Building and Safety Division, to provide long-term dust stabilization under the arrays.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Biologist	LACFD LACDRP
AQ-11 Earth disturbing activities shall be suspended and/or additional water shall be applied to meet Rule 403 criteria if wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP AVAQMD
AQ-12 Construction activity shall utilize electricity from power poles on or adjacent to the Project sites rather than use of temporary diesel power generators and/or gasoline power generators when electricity with adequate circuit capacity is available from power poles in proximity to construction areas.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
AQ-13 In the event temporary night lighting is necessary for construction or maintenance purposes, lighting not requiring the use of diesel or gasoline driven generators shall be used.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
B-1 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a qualified biologist shall be retained by the Applicant as the lead biological monitor subject to the approval of the LACDRP and CDFW. That person shall ensure that impacts to all biological resources are minimized or avoided, and shall conduct (or supervise) pre-grading field surveys for species that may be avoided, affected, or eliminated as a result of grading or any other site preparation activities. The lead biological monitor shall ensure that all surveys are conducted by qualified personnel (e.g. avian biologists for bird surveys, herpetologists for reptile surveys, etc.) and that they possess	A. Retain qualified Biologist(s)	Prior to issuance of Grading Permit	Applicant/Construction Monitor	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Field Surveys	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Maintain daily monitoring reports	During Construction	Applicant/Construction Monitor	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
all necessary permits and memoranda of understanding with the appropriate agencies for the handling of potentially-occurring special-status species. The lead biological monitor shall also ensure that daily monitoring reports (e.g., survey results, protective actions, results of protective actions, adaptive measures, etc.) are prepared, and shall make these monitoring reports available to DRP and CDFW at their request.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-2 Pre-Construction surveys will be conducted prior to ground disturbance at each project site. These surveys will include all special-status species identified as having the potential to be present on the project site; including, but not limited to, badger, kit fox, southern grasshopper mouse, and the species listed below. • Pre-survey information gathering will include reviewing of all available agency nest data and mapping. • A focused pre-construction Swainson's hawk survey shall be conducted to locate any nesting sites within 5 miles of Projects 1 – 6. If Swainson's hawks or their active nests are located within 500 feet of the project sites, all construction-related work shall be postponed and CDFW will be consulted. • Project-related activities likely to have the potential of disturbing suitable bird nesting habitat, which includes ground nesting birds, shall be prohibited from February 1 through August 31, unless a qualified monitoring biologist conducts nesting bird surveys prior to any construction-related disturbance to confirm the absence of active bird nests or bird nesting habitat. Disturbance shall be defined as any activity that physically removes or damages vegetation or habitat or any action that may cause disruption of nesting behavior such as loud noise from equipment or artificial night lighting. Surveys shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. If an active bird nest is discovered, disturbance within 500 feet for raptors shall be postponed until the nest is vacated, offspring are independent of the nest area and there is no evidence of further attempts at nesting. Limits of avoidance shall be marked with high-visibility flagging or fencing. The Applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures and submit the records to LACDRP and CDFW to document compliance with applicable state and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds. • A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted on each site prior to grading. Pre-construction surveys for burrowing owl shall be conducted weekly, beginning no later than 30 days and ending no earlier than 3 days prior to	Pre-construction surveys for special-status species that have been identified as having potential to occur on site	Prior to grading or as specified per species	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
the commencement of disturbance. The surveys shall follow the protocols set forth by the California Burrowing Owl Consortium (1993 and 2012). If burrowing owls are found during the pre-construction survey, then replacement burrows and habitat must be provided prior to the commencement of construction. The Applicant shall be prepared to provide artificial replacement burrows in the event that owls are detected, either as wintering or breeding individuals. Wintering individuals may be evicted with the use of exclusion devices followed by a period of seven days to ensure that animals have left their burrows. When it can be assured that owls are no longer using the burrows, the burrows can be hand excavated and collapsed under the supervision of the avian biologist. Breeding owls must not be disturbed and must be allowed to complete the raising of young until the fledglings can forage independently of adults and it can be confirmed that further attempts at nesting shall not be undertaken. When this has been confirmed, the owls can be evicted as described above for wintering animals. • Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for special-status ground-dwelling reptiles, including but not limited to coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard. Surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground 4 to 6 weeks in advance of the survey effort, checking weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles or other species determined important by the qualified biological monitor (i.e., biologist must be appropriately permitted for collection and relocation activities) occurring within the work area prior to the start of work shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.				
B-3 During grading, earthmoving activities, and other construction activities the biological monitor shall be present to inspect and enforce all mitigation requirements and to relocate any species that may come into harm's way to an appropriate offsite location of similar habitat. The biological monitor shall be authorized to stop specific grading or	Biological Monitoring	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
construction activities if violations of mitigation measures or any local, state, or federal laws are suspected. The biological monitor shall file a report of the monitoring activities with LACDRP and CDFW. If ongoing biological monitoring of construction activities reveals the presence of any special-status reptiles within an active work area, then work shall be temporarily halted until the animals can be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones. Work areas shall be surveyed for special-status reptile species, such as the coast horned lizard and northern California legless lizard, during construction activities. During the construction, surveys shall be conducted by placing coverboards on the ground in appropriate work areas and checking them weekly for such species. Any special-status reptiles occurring within the work area shall be collected and relocated to areas outside of the designated work zones.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-4 Mitigation lands shall be acquired for Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, special-status migratory and wintering birds, and alkali mariposa lily. <u>Swainson's hawk</u>: Impacts due to development of the projects shall be mitigated by the acquisition of good quality Swainson's hawk habitat targeted within the Antelope Valley. Land shall be purchased or placed in a conservation easement or other suitable deed restriction and managed to maintain suitable habitat in perpetuity. The proposed development is not expected to result in the "take" of Swainson's hawk; however, the Applicant shall be required to consult CDFW in the event of take, which may result in additional mitigation prescribed by CDFW. Although the Projects are not expected to result in "take" of Swainson's hawk, mitigation will still be required to alleviate the effects of cumulative impacts on raptor, migratory bird, and burrowing owl habitats: Replacement land will be provided based on the quality of the mitigation land relative to the impacted habitat. The ratio of such replacement shall be determined as follows: • A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 3 acres of development if the replacement land is superior nesting and foraging habitat contiguous to occupied nesting and foraging habitat, and is within a designated or proposed Significant Ecological Area (SEA). • A ratio of one acre of replacement land for each 2 acres of development if the replacement land is unoccupied irrigated land, contiguous to occupied habitat and providing superior quality foraging habitat with trees or other such nesting habitat; • A ratio of 1 acre of replacement land for each acre of development if the replacement land provides similar foraging and nesting habitat. <u>Burrowing Owl</u>: Mitigation for any occupied burrowing owl burrows found during pre-construction surveys will include a comprehensive tiered approach: • Pre-construction and construction monitoring surveys conducted by a qualified biologist to detect potential new owl activity onsite;	A. Acquire mitigation lands for Swainson's Hawk	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Acquire mitigation lands for Burrowing Owl	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Pre-construction survey for Alkali Mariposa Lilies	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	D. If necessary Acquire Alkali Mariposa Mitigation land	Prior to 1st either grading or building permits	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
• Disturbance avoidance of occupied burrows during nesting period February 1 – August 31; • Impact avoidance of occupied burrows; • Burrow exclusion and closure and offsite relocation (>100 m), as described previously in in B-2, will be conducted for unavoidable impacts to occupied burrows (after consultation with CDFW). • Minimizing impacts by protecting in-place any owls, their burrows, and their immediate habitat by establishing setback zones and visual screens for burrows adjacent to construction activity; by placing visible markers, and by conducting construction worker awareness training. Setback widths will be applied as appropriate to the level of existing disturbance and owl stage of activity (e.g., for low to moderate construction-related disturbance activity outside the nesting season near burrows in currently high-traffic or disturbance areas, it is assumed owls are adapted to human disturbance and will not need a large setback). • Mitigating unavoidable impacts to habitat: restore temporary impacts to pre-existing conditions; replace nesting/occupied and satellite burrows lost with the same number of suitable burrows on the mitigation site. Mitigation acreage for foraging habitat provided for Swainson's hawk will be sufficient to replace lost burrowing owl habitat because the hawk's replacement habitat will be in-kind or better (i.e., the Project habitat is low quality overall and mitigation habitat will be at least the same quality as the lost habitat OR will have higher quality habitat features overall, such as increased vegetative structure, higher numbers of prey species, less disturbance, and less potential for predation by domestic animals, etc.). Specific habitat considerations as provided in the CDFW 2012 burrowing owl guidance will be considered in selecting the overall habitat replacement acres for the project. <u>Alkali Mariposa Lily</u>: Alkali mariposa lily will be avoided to the greatest extent possible. If pre-construction surveys reveal individuals that cannot be avoided, mitigation of lost alkali mariposa lily shall be provided at a minimum 1:1 ratio. This acreage will be calculated with input from LACDRP and CDFW. Additionally, because alkali mariposa Lilies have locally available seed sources, plantings of the lilies on				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
appropriate soil types on Projects shall be implemented in selected areas. The lilies may also be transplanted from areas planned for disturbance to more suitable locations in the Project area. Transplantation locations must be situated within adequately buffered areas to be found suitable. For all species the mitigation acreage may be located within the Project sites, but outside of the area of development, subject to LACDRP and CDFW approval, if acreage of sufficient quantity and quality exists.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
B-5 Review and Approval of Habitat Management Lands Prior to Acquisition: The Applicant shall provide a mitigation land acquisition proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for their approval before acquiring the property. The proposal shall discuss the suitability of the property by comparing it to the selection criteria. As a part of the preparation of the land acquisition proposal, acreage quantification by habitat category will be developed with LACDRP and CDFW based on the following criteria: <u>Habitat Management Land Selection Criteria</u>: The Applicant must identify the region within which lands shall be acquired, and the type and quality of habitat to be acquired. Detailed criteria and acreage for each habitat category will be developed with Los Angeles County and CDFW. Foraging habitat shall be assessed as moderate to good with a capacity to improve in quality and value to Swainson's hawks, and must be within the Antelope Valley Swainson's hawk breeding range. Foraging habitat with suitable nest trees is preferred. <u>Habitat Management Lands Acquisition</u>: Prior to initiating ground-disturbing activities, the Applicant shall provide a proposal to LACDRP and CDFW for off-site mitigation land to be restored, enhanced, or maintained according to the requirements of the biological mitigation measures in this EIR. The proposal will require that mitigation lands identified shall be preserved as open space in perpetuity. Within 45 days of acquiring the mitigation land(s), the Applicant shall record a permanent deed restriction on the mitigation land(s) to be preserved as open space. The deed restriction or conservation easement language shall be submitted to LACDRP and CDFW for review and approval prior to recordation. Alternatively, should a conservation easement on the mitigation land be offered, the permanent conservation easement shall be recorded to the satisfaction of LACDRP and CDFW. The Applicant shall establish a fund sufficient for the restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation land(s) until such time when the mitigation land(s) become self-sustaining and until such time as the mitigation land(s) meet the requirements of this mitigation measure. The fund shall be established within 90 days of mitigation land(s)	A. Obtain approval of habitat management lands	Prior to Acquisition	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	B. Record a permanent deed restriction or conservation easement on mitigation land(s)	Within 45 days of acquiring land(s)	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW
	C. Establish fund in the amount acceptable to LACDRP and CDFW for restoration, enhancement, and maintenance of the mitigation lands	Within 90-days of mitigation land(s) acquisition	Applicant	LACDRP CDFW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
acquisition in an amount acceptable to the LACDRP and CDFW.				
Land Acquisition Schedule and Financial Assurances: The Applicant shall complete acquisition, or execute an irrevocable option to purchase, of proposed Habitat Management lands and shall provide financial assurances for dedicating adequate funding for impact avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures, if necessary, prior to the issuance of building permits. If an irrevocable option to purchase is utilized, the applicant shall provide a proposed date of purchase which coincides with construction of the facility.				
B-6 Prior to alteration of any streambeds, the Applicant shall enter into an agreement with the CDFW, pursuant to Sections 1601 through 1603 of the State Fish and Game Code.	Enter into an agreement with CDFW pursuant to sections 1601 through 1603	Prior to alteration of Streambed	Applicant	CDFW
B-7 Within all interior portions of the site within and adjacent to the proposed solar arrays, re-vegetation shall be accomplished (excluding interior roads as follows: Vegetation seeded in these areas shall comprise locally-sourced, native species if available, or, native compatible as approved by the County biologist if sufficient locally-sourced native seed stock not available, approximating low-growing communities such as native perennial or annual grasslands (i.e., wildflower fields). Shrub species shall not be used due to these species inability to survive continued vegetation trimming. Vegetation shall be maintained in accordance with Los Angeles County Fire Department regulations.	Revegetation of interior site, excluding interior roads	After construction	Applicant	LACDRP
5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES				
CUL-1 In the event cultural resources are encountered during construction of the Projects, all ground-disturbing activities within the vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall be notified of the find. The archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American Monirot shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to recordation and excavation of the finds and evaluation and processing of the finds in accordance with § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Potentially significant cultural resources	A. Archaeological monitoring and Native American monitor when there is a find	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP NAHC
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Site inspection as needed	During earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
consist of, but are not limited to, stone, bone, fossils, wood or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resources are determined to be unique historic resources as defined under § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, Mitigation Measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate Mitigation Measures for significant resources could include but not be limited to avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. No further earthwork shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any archaeological artifacts recovered because of mitigation will be donated to a qualified scientific institution approved by the Lead Agency where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.			Archaeologist	
CUL-2 In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, California State Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 dictates that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to CEQA regulations and PRC § 5097.98. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to all Projects.	A. Archaeological and Native American monitoring	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist/NAHC representative	LACDRP NAHC
	B. Maintain documentation demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-3 Project 4 construction of gen-tie lines shall maintain the right of way buffer zones prescribed by SCE for this historic electric transmission line resource, which is an active transmission line. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-4 Project construction for Project 4 shall maintain a one acre undisturbed area surrounding the Del Sur Cemetery	A. Submit pre-construction surveys	Prior to construction	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
site. This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	B. Construction monitoring by qualified Archaeologist	During construction	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	C. Submit construction monitoring documentation	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	D. Site inspection as needed	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	Applicant/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
CUL-5 A County approved archaeologist will be retained to initiate and supervise cultural resource monitoring during Project related earthwork in areas of the Project that are within 50 feet from certain significant cultural resources, specifically from the defined perimeter of site CA-LAN-1579H (Project 4). If resources are identified, the procedures outlined in CUL-1 will be followed and/or CUL-2 (as necessary). This Mitigation Measure shall apply to Project 4 only.	A. Archaeological monitoring	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Archaeologist	LACDRP
PALEO-1: A qualified paleontologist shall be retained by the Applicant prior to excavations reaching 10 feet in depth or greater. A The paleontologist shall develop and execute a Paleontological Resource Mitigation and Monitoring Program and supervise a paleontological monitor whom shall monitor all ground-disturbing activities associated with such excavations. The Program will outline the procedures to follow in regards to paleontological resources (e.g. monitoring protocols, curation, data recovery of fossils, reporting). If fossils are found during such excavation, the paleontological monitor shall be authorized to halt ground-disturbing activities within 25 feet of the find in order to allow evaluation of the find and determination of appropriate treatment according to the Program.	Paleontological Monitoring	During Project related earthmoving activities	Applicant/Construction Manager/Qualified Paleontologist	LACDRP LAC Natural History Museum support/referral
5.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
No mitigation measures are required for Geology and Soils.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS				
GHG-1 All off-road diesel powered construction equipment less than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 2 off-road emission standards. Off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than or equal to 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emission standards. The construction equipment	A. Submit operating permit(s) as required	Prior to commencement of construction	Applicant	AVAQMD LACDRP
	B. Maintain log	During construction	Applicant/Construction	AVAQMD

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
requirement shall be increased to Tier 4 off-road emission standards by January 1, 2015. Post-January 1, 2015, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet or exceed Tier 4 off-road emission standards, where available. Verification documentation such as an ongoing log shall be provided to the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning upon request within five business days.	demonstrating compliance		Manager	LACDRP
GHG-2 During construction, the off-road equipment, vehicles, and trucks shall not be idle more than five minutes in any one hour.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-3 The off-road construction equipment drivers shall have proper training in operating the equipment efficiently, taking into account ways to reduce the hours of operations of the equipment and/or operate the equipment at a lower load factor.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-4 Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 mph or less.	Site inspection as needed	During construction and grading	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP
GHG-5 During construction, there shall be documented carpools, vanpools, and/or shuttles provided for construction employees.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	Prior to Building Permit	Applicant/Construction Manager	AVAQMD LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
5.8 HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS WASTES				
HH-1 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Materials Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.	Submit Hazardous Materials Management Plan	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC
HH-2 Prior to the start of construction activities, a Hazardous Waste Management Plan shall be implemented for each project.	Submit Hazardous Waste Management Plan for each Project	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC
HH-3 Prior to the start of construction activities on the parcel containing the historic UST at the location of Project 1, a Phase I ESA will be completed. This mitigation measure only applies to Project 1.	Phase I ESA	Prior to issuance of grading permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP
HH-4 Prior to the start of construction activities, a closure permit for the UST will be verified or obtained from the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Health Hazardous Materials Division. This mitigation measure only applies to Project 1.	Closure permit or verification for UST – Project 1 site	Prior to issuance of grading permit(s)	Applicant	LACFD
HH-5 Construction activities shall be halted if previously unidentified soil contamination is observed or indicated by testing during any earthwork activities. Construction will be halted or redirected until such soil contamination is evaluated and disposed of and/or treated	Testing of soil contamination	Prior to start of construction	Applicant	DTSC LACDRP
5.9 HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY				
Construction				
HYDRO-1 Education and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants and Employees. Appropriate educational materials and training for preventing stormwater pollution and additional BMP Fact Sheets from the California Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks can be found at www.cabmphandbooks.com. Practical information material will be provided to employees on general good housekeeping practices. These materials will describe, but are not limited to, spill prevention and control and the use of chemicals, petroleum products, pesticides and fertilizers that should be limited to the property, with no discharge of wastes directly or indirectly to gutters, catch basins or the storm drain system. Information will be distributed directly to the employees as well as being posted in public areas. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities. The required materials shall be	Maintain log demonstrating compliance of Educational materials and training for Property Owners, Tenants, Occupants, and Employee	During Construction	Applicant	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
available at each project site and a log kept to show education has occurred prior to the start of construction.				
HYDRO-2 A spill contingency plan will be prepared by the owner/building operator. As a minimum the Spill Contingency Plan will "mandate the stockpiling of cleanup materials, notification of responsible agencies, disposal of cleanup materials and documentation." This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Submit spill contingency plan	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACDRP
HYDRO-3 No hazardous materials are anticipated to be stored on-site. If deemed otherwise, a designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in accordance with requirements of the Health & Safety Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction and operations	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACFD
HYDRO-4 A designated representative of the owner shall provide information to the Fire Authority in compliance of the current requirements of the County of Los Angeles Fire Code. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 for the entire duration of construction activities.	Submit all applicable information	Prior to grading permit	Applicant	LACFD
Operation				
HYDRO-5 Site waste receptacles shall be emptied on a weekly basis or more often if containers approach overflowing. Upon inspection any debris or rubbish will be picked up and the site cleaned. The trash area/room is NOT to be cleaned by hosing down. The type of materials used to clean the area and storage of said materials will be determined by the Contractor. Signage will be posted that lids shall be kept closed at all times. This Mitigation Measure shall be implemented at Projects 1 – 6 at all times during facility operations.	A. Include waste collection and disposal methods in construction contract specifications	During operation	Applicant	LACSD LACDRP
	B. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During operation	Applicant	LACSD LACDRP
5.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING				
No mitigation measures are required for Land Use and Planning	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.11 NOISE				
N-1 Construction operations would not occur between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays or Saturday, or at any time on Sunday with the exception of limited low-noise	Maintain log of construction equipment arrivals and exit times demonstrating	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
generating potential night work with Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning and Public Works approval.	compliance			
N-2 Construction site and access road maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour shall be established and enforced during the construction period.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-3 Electrically-powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, except for devices like trucks, loaders, dozers, and other heavy equipment.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-4 Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking, and maintenance areas shall be located as far as practicable, and no closer than 1,000 feet, from noise-sensitive receptors.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
	B. Inclusion of requirement for a Noise Control Plan	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
N-5 The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells are prohibited except where required by OSHA or for safety or emergency warning purposes required by other regulatory agencies.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
N-6 Project-related public address or music systems used on-site shall not be audible at any adjacent receptor.	Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
N-7 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 which are in compliance with any applicable legally required equipment noise standards. Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g., arc-welders, air compressors) shall be equipped with shrouds and/or other noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment. Mobile sound barriers with a sound transmission class of 19 or greater will be used for pile driving on Projects where received sound levels at the nearest NSR are predicted to be above the County construction noise limit of 60 dBA during the day.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH – Health Officer for referral
	B. Site inspection as needed	During Construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including: **N-8** Siting substations to achieve NEMA sound ratings at sensitive receptors as described in Section 4.11.5.2 not to be closer to the property line of sensitive receptors than the following distances for each individual project: • Project 1 – 325 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 74 dBA • Project 2 – 1,511 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 81 dBA • Project 3 – 650 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 74 dBA • Project 4 (two transformers) – 1,000 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 77 dBA • Project 5 – 748 feet with a NEMA sound rating of 82 dBA	A. Submit acoustical report demonstrating substation design compliance with applicable noise standards	Prior to issuance of relevant building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer
	B. Construct structures in compliance with noise limit requirements of applicable County codes.	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH
	C. Submit post-construction noise measurements verifying compliance upon request	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support/referral
With respect to mitigation during operation, potential impacts associated with on-site substations are considered. Depending on the Project's acoustic design goals, final substation design may incorporate appropriate mitigation measures, including: **N-9** The Applicant shall choose to use NEMA low noise rated transformer equipment which will achieve 10 dBA or greater noise reduction as compared to standard NEMA-rated transformers of a similar size and rated capacity to ensure that Project noise impacts would be less than significant.	A. Submit acoustical report demonstrating substation design compliance with applicable noise standards	Prior to issuance of relevant building permit(s)	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer
	B. Construct structures in compliance with noise limit requirements of applicable County codes.	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP LACDPH
	C. Submit post-construction noise measurements verifying compliance upon request	Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support/referral
5.12 PUBLIC SERVICES				
No mitigation measures are required for Public Services	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.13 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC				
TT-1 Prior to issuance of first grading or building permit, Applicant shall document and submit all required information	Submit Projects' road survey	Prior to issuance of first grading or building	Applicant	LACDPW

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
and/or material pertaining to the pavement conditions of construction routes for the Projects, including the formula for calculation of the Projects' fair share of any repair or reconstruction of construction routes to the satisfaction of LACDPW. Applicant shall reimburse the County of Los Angeles for the cost of any repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes attributable to the Projects as agreed to by LACDPW. The timing of any necessary repairs and/or reconstruction of construction routes and the required payment by the Applicant shall be determined by LACDPW.		permit		
TT-2 The County, including LACFD Fire Stations 78 (for R2011-00801) and 130 (for R2011-00798, 00799, 00805,00807, & 00833) shall be notified at least three days in advance of any street closures that may affect fire and/or paramedic responses in the area. The Applicant shall provide alternate route (detour) plans to the County, including three sets to LACFD, with a tentative schedule of planned closures, prior to the beginning of construction.	Provide street closure notifications	Three days prior to any street closures impacting fire and/or paramedics	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACFD
TT-3 Stagger construction work shifts before or after peak traffic hours.	A. Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support referral Caltrans
	B. Site inspection as needed	During construction	Applicant	LACDRP LACDPH Health Officer – for support referral Caltrans
TT-4 Schedule truck deliveries during off peak hours.	Maintain log of truck arrivals and exit times demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
TT-5 Limit water truck deliveries during the AM peak hour to 30 percent of the daily water truck trips.	Maintain log of truck arrivals and exit times demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
TT-6 Encourage carpooling between construction works.	Maintain log demonstrating compliance	During construction	Applicant/Construction Manager	LACDRP
5.14 UTILITIES				
No mitigation measures are required for Utilities.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Mitigation Timing	Responsible Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
List of Acronyms: B & S – building and safety BMP – Best Management Practice CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act CASQA – California Association of Stormwater Quality Agencies CBC – California Building Code CDFW – California Department of Fish and Wildlife CUP – Conditional Use Permit CVC – California Vehicle Code dBA – decibels (acoustics) DPR – Department of Parks and Recreation ESA – Environmental Site Assessment hp – Horsepower LACDPW – Los Angeles County Department of Public Works LACFD – Los Angeles County Fire Department mph – miles per hour NEMA – National Electrical Manufacturers Association OSHA – Occupational Safety and Health Administration PRC – Public Resources Code ROW – Right of Way SCE – Southern California Edison SWPPP – Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan UFC – Uniform Fire Code UST – Underground Storage Tank WATCH – Work Area Traffic Control Handbook LACDPH – Los Angeles County Department of Public Health LACSD – Los Angeles County Sanitation District				