
1.0 INTRODUCTION/SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) is to inform decision-makers and the general public of the potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center Transition Master Plan (“Proposed Project”). The project applicant is Waste Management Recycling & Disposal Services of California, Inc., located at 9227 Tujunga Avenue, Sun Valley, CA 91352. A detailed description of the proposed project is contained in Section 3.0 (Project Description) of this EIR.

As described in Section 15121(a) and 15362 of the Guidelines for California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA Guidelines”),¹ an EIR is an informational document which will inform public agency decision-makers and the public of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize any significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project. Therefore, the purpose of this EIR is to focus the discussion on those potential effects on the environment of the Proposed Project which the lead agency has determined are or may be significant. In addition, feasible mitigation measures are recommended, when applicable, that could reduce or avoid significant environmental impacts.

This EIR was prepared in accordance with Section 15151 of the CEQA Guidelines, which defines the standards for EIR adequacy:

An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decisionmakers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure.

¹ California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 3, Sections 15000-15387.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS

In general, the approval process and operating requirements for landfills in the State of California is governed by State law and regulation. Overall governance of the process is vested in the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB). Implementation of certain permitting requirements is delegated by State law to local agencies, called Local Enforcement Agencies (LEA). LEAs are statutorily defined as a local agency designated by the CIWMB for the purpose of carrying out the obligations created by Division 30 (Waste Management) of the California Public Resources Code (PRC)². The California Code of Regulations (CCR) also define an LEA as:

An enforcement agency with board certification(s) totally separate from the operating unit(s) of a local governing body. An LEA is a comprehensive solid waste enforcement agency which performs permitting, inspection and enforcement duties for solid waste handling and permitted ... facilities. An LEA is solely responsible for carrying out solid waste enforcement in its jurisdiction (Title 14, CCR, Section 18011(a)(16)).

The Proposed Project will require approval of certain discretionary actions by the City of Los Angeles (the "City") and other governmental agencies. Specifically,

- Land use approvals must be obtained from the City of Los Angeles for the proposed vertical expansion of the landfill³. Currently, the Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center (BLRC) operates under a zone variance issued by the City of Los Angeles, which expires on April 14, 2007. A revised zone variance will need to be approved by the Zoning Administrator, City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, to permit the proposed landfill expansion on the project site.
- If the zone variance is approved and the EIR is certified, the City of Los Angeles, Environmental Affairs Department, as the LEA, would be required to approve combining the two Solid Waste Facility Permits (SWFP) that presently apply to the site into one revised SWFP for the landfill and issue a separate permit for the proposed Transfer Station (TS)/Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) and other recycling activities.
- If approved by the LEA, the CIWMB reviews the SWFP and provides concurrence with the revised SWFP.

A complete list of approvals and permits required for the Proposed Project is contained in Section 3.0, Project Description, of this EIR. Because the Proposed Project is subject to the discretionary approvals noted above, the Proposed Project is subject to environmental review under the California Environmental

² *Public Resources Code Sections 40000-49620.*

³ *The proposed Transfer Station and MRF are permitted uses under the M-3 zoning that applies to the proposed project site and do not require additional land use approvals other than a permit issued by the Environmental Affairs Department pursuant to Section 66.13.1 of the City Municipal Code..*

Quality Act (CEQA).⁴ For purposes of complying with CEQA, the City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, is identified as the Lead Agency for the Proposed Project. The Environmental Affairs Department (as LEA) will serve as a Responsible Agency under CEQA.

PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

Previous environmental documents prepared for the site include:

- 1974-1975 EIR (Conrock Co.) for Bradley West (ZV 21910);
- 1977 SEIR for Livingston Graham (Bradley West Extension) (ZV 77-203);
- 1986 MND for the 1987 SWFP expansion from 1,500 tons per day (tpd) to 7,000 tpd;
- 1991 MND for Zone Variance Case No. 92-0002; and
- 1996 MND for ZV 94-0792 and 92-0002 analyzing increase from 7,000 tpd to 10,000 tpd and 1996 SWFP revision.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

Notice of Preparation

In compliance with Sections 15082 and 15375 of the State of California CEQA Guidelines, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was prepared by the Department of City Planning and distributed to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research, Trustee and Responsible Agencies and other interested parties on November 27, 2002. The NOP for the Draft EIR was scheduled to be circulated until December 31, 2002. A public informational meeting was held on December 12, 2002. Notice of this meeting was provided to owners and occupants located within approximately one mile of the Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center. Based upon input provided by elected officials, agencies and members of the public who attended the informational meeting and specific requests from the City Council members who represent the areas surrounding the BLRC, a scoping meeting was scheduled. The scoping meeting was held on April 24, 2003, and the time frame for providing written comments on the NOP was extended to May 23, 2003. At the request of the cognizant City Council members (District 6 and District 7), notice of the scoping meeting, in English and Spanish, was mailed to all owners and occupants located within an approximately 3-mile radius of the Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center. The mailing for the scoping meeting included more than 30,000 addresses. Appendix A to this EIR contains a copy of the NOP, notices of the informational meeting and the scoping meeting, and a map showing the area that

⁴ *Public Resources Code Sections 21000-21178.*

received notice of the scoping meeting. Appendix B to this EIR contains the written responses to the NOP that were received by the City and the court reporter's transcript of the scoping meeting⁵.

Environmental Issues to be Analyzed in the Draft EIR

Based on a review of environmental issues by the Department of City Planning, this Draft EIR analyzes the following environmental issues:

- Land Use/Planning
- Transportation/Circulation
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Aesthetics/Views
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology
- Hazardous Materials
- Utilities (Wastewater)

Through the Initial Study and because the site is an existing landfill in an urban environment, the Department of City Planning determined that the Proposed Project would not have the potential to cause environmental impacts on agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, recreation and utilities (water, solid waste, electricity, natural gas). Therefore, these issues are not examined in detail in this EIR (see Section 4.1, Impacts Found To Be Less Than Significant).

Environmental Review Process

The Draft EIR will be circulated for review and comment by the public and other interested parties, agencies and organizations for 90 days. Public hearings on the Proposed Project will be held after the review period and completion of the Final EIR. Notice of the time and location of such hearings will be published prior to the public hearing date. All comments or questions about the Draft EIR should be addressed to:

Jimmy Liao, City Planner
City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning
200 North Spring Street, Room 750
Los Angeles, California 90012
Fax: (213) 978-1343
Jliao@Planning.Lacity.org

⁵ A verbatim transcript was not taken at the informational meeting on December 12, 2002.

Following public circulation of the Draft EIR, a Final EIR will be prepared that responds to comments received during the public circulation period. The Final EIR will be available for public review prior to its certification by the City.

Organization of the EIR

The EIR is organized into nine sections.

Section 1.0 (Introduction/Summary): This section provides a summary of the project description, alternatives to the Proposed Project, environmental impacts and mitigation measures.

Section 2.0 (Environmental Setting/Baseline and Regulatory Requirements): This section provides an overview of the project site and surrounding area, including a description of existing and surrounding land uses, a description of the place and role of the BLRC within the system of regional solid waste facilities that presently provides for disposal of solid waste in Los Angeles County, description of the regulatory requirements and permits presently applicable to the site and a list of related projects proposed or under construction in the project area.

Section 3.0 (Project Description): This section includes a detailed description of the Proposed Project, including project location, project characteristics, project objectives and required discretionary actions.

Section 4.0 (Environmental Impact Analysis): This section is the primary focus of the EIR because it presents an analysis of each potentially significant environmental impact issue of the Proposed Project. Each environmental resource section contains a discussion of existing conditions in the project area, an assessment and discussion of the significance of impacts resulting from the Proposed Project, cumulative impacts, mitigation measures and level of significance after mitigation.

Section 5.0 (General Impact Categories): This section provides a summary of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Proposed Project, a discussion of potential growth inducing impacts resulting from the Proposed Project and an analysis of environmental justice implications associated with the Proposed Project within the context of other industrial uses in the Sun Valley area.

Section 6.0 (Alternatives to the Proposed Project): This section includes an analysis of a range of reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Project.

Section 7.0 (Preparers of the EIR and Persons Consulted): This section includes a list of City and other agencies and consultants that contributed to the preparation of the EIR.

Section 8.0 (References): This section includes a list of written materials used in the preparation of the EIR.

Section 9.0 (List of Acronyms and Abbreviations): This section provides definitions for all of the acronyms and abbreviations used in the EIR.

PROPOSED PROJECT

The Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center (BLRC) is a Class III (non-hazardous) municipal solid waste (MSW) disposal and recycling facility located at 9227 Tujunga Avenue in the Sun Valley community of the City of Los Angeles. The BLRC is a 209-acre facility that consists of two sub-areas: Bradley West/West Extension and Bradley East.

Industrial development activities on the 209-acre BLRC site began in 1958 when the site was purchased by CalMat, a sand and aggregate operator. CalMat initially used the site for sand and gravel excavation and extraction, eventually resulting in a steep-walled excavation pit with an average depth of 160 feet. The excavated materials were used by CalMat for aggregate and concrete operations. In addition to sand and gravel excavations, CalMat began using a portion of the site for MSW disposal (currently known as the Bradley East area), starting in 1958, and began disposing of MSW in the area currently known as Bradley West in 1980, under a separate Zone Variance. CalMat conducted these combined sand and gravel mining and MSW disposal activities on the BLRC site until the mid 1980s when the applicant purchased the site from CalMat on December 31, 1986.

The Applicant has conducted MSW disposal activities at the BLRC since 1986 under appropriate State and local permits as described below. The contiguous Bradley West Extension was added later to Bradley West as one permitted unit. There is currently no landfill capacity left in Bradley East, although this area currently supports green and wood waste processing operations, an intermittent Material Recycling Facility (MRF), and landfill gas collection and flaring, along with electricity generation using landfill gas.

The total fill acreage (Bradley West/West Extension and Bradley East) covers approximately 171 acres. Bradley East includes approximately 45 acres of landfill footprint, while Bradley West/West Extension includes approximately 126 acres designated as the landfill refuse footprint. Bradley West/West Extension is the only portion of the facility that currently has remaining disposal capacity. Intermediate cover has been placed on all slopes of the Bradley West/West Extension area.

The BLRC (including Bradley West/West Extension and Bradley East) currently operates under a Zone Variance granted by the City of Los Angeles (Case No. ZA 94-0792(ZV)). Bradley West/West Extension also currently operates under a SWFP issued by the City of Los Angeles Department of Environmental Affairs (LEA) and concurred in by the CIWMB (Permit No. 19-AR-0008). Operations on Bradley East are addressed in SWFP No. 19-AR-0004. The City Zone Variance is valid until April 14, 2007. The SWFPs have no expiration date.

The BLRC has been one of the largest landfill operations in Los Angeles County, with State and local permits allowing it to receive up to 10,000 tons of MSW per day, seven days a week. BLRC is currently operating and has, for the last several years, operated well below the permitted rates as it has drawn close to its maximum permitted site disposal capacity. This EIR evaluates the applicant's proposed transitional activities associated with the change from on-site landfilling to use of the site as a Transfer Station/Materials Recycling Facility (TS/MRF). The existing landfill on Bradley West/West Extension

currently accepts residential, commercial, and industrial MSW that is generated throughout the greater Los Angeles area. It also accepts electronic waste (computers, televisions, etc) and white goods (appliances). The facility does NOT accept hazardous, radioactive, or untreated medical waste(s). The landfill also is permitted to accept inert debris and soil for internal road base, wet weather areas, cover and other beneficial uses. Current operations on Bradley East consist of green and wood waste processing of up to 1,260 tons per day, an intermittent MRF processing up to 92 tons per day, equipment storage and maintenance, and landfill gas collection and flaring, along with electricity generation using landfill gas.

To accomplish the proposed transition activities, the project applicant has developed a plan to accommodate immediate short-term disposal needs in Los Angeles and to assist Los Angeles in meeting its future waste disposal and recycling needs. The Proposed Project consists of two phases, and involves proposed activities on both Bradley West/West Extension and Bradley East. The purpose of the Proposed Project is to provide for an orderly transition of the BLRC from an active landfill to a TS/MRF operation that will process solid waste for transport to other, more remote regional landfills and recycled materials processing facilities and to enhance green and woodwaste recycling facilities. Proposed Phase I activities under the Master Plan would be completed by April 14, 2007, when the existing zone variance expires. Proposed Phase II activities under the Master Plan would begin in 2007. Figure 3-4, in Section 3 provides a timeline of the various activities under each Phase.

Phase I Activities

Vertical Expansion

Proposed Phase I activities on Bradley West/West Extension would include a transitional 43-foot vertical landfill expansion that will provide additional short-term disposal capacity within the boundaries of the existing landfill, while the transition to a TS/MRF operation is taking place. The height increase will create an additional 4.7 million cubic yards (cy) of disposal capacity and allow the landfill to operate until the currently permitted closure date of April 14, 2007. The proposed height increase would be visible from the surrounding areas, but would be designed to integrate visually with the existing landfill contours in order to reduce visual contrast to the extent feasible⁶. As part of the Phase I project, the applicant proposes to reduce the existing maximum permitted daily disposal tonnage at the landfill from 10,000 tons per day (tpd) to 7,000 tpd for the transitional period. The transitional period would last from the time the proposed project is approved until the landfill's closure date of April 14, 2007 or when the landfill reaches capacity, whichever comes first. As of April 14, 2007, no additional waste would be accepted for disposal in the landfill. This change would be included in the unified SWFP for Bradley West/West Extension and Bradley East, along with the requested increase in permitted height. Parameters of the proposed increase in disposal capacity that would be associated with the proposed transitional 43-foot vertical expansion, in cubic yards (cy), are:

⁶ A detailed analysis of visual conditions before and after implementation of the proposed transitional vertical expansion is contained in Section 4.6 of this EIR.

- Additional airspace from expansion: 4,700,000 cy
- Assuming 1,500 pounds per cy, capacity of expansion: 3,525,000 tons⁷
- Assuming disposal of 7,000 tons per day and 318 days per year, this capacity will last approximately 1.5 years.⁸

Construction Activities

Phase I of the Proposed Project would also encompass activities associated with construction of a 4,000 tpd TS and 1,000 tpd MRF adjacent to the existing landfill. These construction activities will occur near the end of Phase I (2006-2007) and will include the importation of dirt⁹ for the foundation of the TS/MRF, associated grading activities, installation of paving and curbing, and erection of the pre-engineered metal building for the new TS/MRF. No demolition will be required as part of this phase.

Green Waste and Existing MRF Expansion

Proposed Phase I activities on Bradley East would also include expansion of the existing green and wood waste operation from 1,260 tpd to 2,500 tpd to provide additional capacity to process green and wood waste materials that are currently processed at another facility in the Sun Valley area, and changes to the existing MRF operation to expand capacity from 92 tpd to 99 tpd¹⁰.

Phase II Activities

New Transfer Station/MRF Operations

Under Phase II of the Proposed Project, the applicant proposes to operate the 4,000 tpd TS and 1,000 tpd MRF to replace the current landfill operation. As the landfill capacity is depleted, the applicant proposes to transition the existing landfill operation into a TS/MRF operation where MSW and recyclable materials would be received, sorted, consolidated and transported to other regional landfills and recycled materials processing facilities. Upon reaching a maximum msl of 1,053 feet or upon expiration of the zone variance in 2007, whichever comes first, the landfill would be closed.

The TS/MRF facility would be located within the facility boundaries of the existing BLRC, on the west side of the existing landfill in a reclaimed sand and gravel mine. The proposed TS/MRF would be an allowable use under the existing M-3 zoning classification of the area of the BLRC site. The existing

⁷ The volume of the additional airspace was calculated using the CAD program and was based upon the top deck footprint multiplied by the vertical expansion height, taking into account the slope requirements of the landfill.

⁸ The calculated disposal capacity associated with the proposed 43-foot vertical expansion is the maximum expected to result from the vertical expansion and must be utilized by April 14, 2007, when the landfill will stop accepting waste. Any remaining permitted landfill capacity as of April 14, 2007 would not be used.

⁹ The source of imported soil would continue to primarily be construction projects throughout Southern California.

¹⁰ The existing MRF facility would continue to operate only until the new TS/MRF becomes operational in Phase II (i.e., on or after April 14, 2007).

entrance, scales, and internal roads will be used for the TS/MRF operations. The TS/MRF will be located in an entirely enclosed state-of-the-art structure designed to provide for odor, dust, noise and litter control. The building will be equipped with fans to provide six air changes every hour. Negative pressure will be maintained at the building entrance so no untreated air will leave the building. An odor neutralizer may be mixed with dust control (water/misters) on the roof as an extra precaution.

Closure Activities

The beginning of Phase II of the Proposed Project on Bradley West/West Extension and portions of Bradley East that have not undergone closure would also encompass activities associated with closing the landfill. These would include: (1) installation of final cover, including importation of approximately 120 loads (240 truck trips) of dirt per day for approximately 254 days and continuation of acceptance of up to 50 loads (100 truck trips) per day (500 tpd) of inert debris for use in closure construction¹¹; (2) planting of vegetation on all slopes, as well as the landfill cap; (3) constructing surface water control structures and (4) transition of the landfill to an end use.

Green and Wood Waste Operations

During post-closure of the landfill, there would be a continuation of the existing wood and green waste operation, the leachate collection and removal system operation, the landfill gas collection and flaring operation, and electricity generation. In addition, the applicant's Sun Valley truck fleet would be converted to operate on low emission alternative fuels during Phase II of the Proposed Project and would work toward meeting emissions-reducing requirements for waste truck fleets established by regulations of the California Air Resources Board.

AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Concerns raised at the informational/public scoping meetings (held on December 12, 2002 and April 24, 2003) and in letters submitted to the Department of City Planning in response to the NOP include access routes, air quality, traffic, land use, noise, aesthetics/views, human health effects, environmental justice issues, hydrology and earth resources. The letters submitted in response to the NOP and comments provided at the scoping meeting are contained in Appendix B to this EIR.

ALTERNATIVES

This EIR considers a reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the Proposed Project to provide informed decision-making in accordance with Title 14, Article 9, Section 15126.6 of the California Code of Regulations (State CEQA Guidelines). The alternatives analyzed in this EIR include: (A) No Project; (B) Reduced Transitional Vertical Expansion (19-foot increase); (C) Reduced TS/MRF; and (D) No Transitional Vertical Expansion.

¹¹ *The source of imported soil would continue to primarily be construction projects throughout Southern California.*

Alternative A: No Project Alternative

Under Alternative A, the Proposed Project would not be constructed. No transitional vertical expansion would occur and the proposed TS/MRF would not be constructed. The landfill would continue to operate under its current permits until the existing capacity is reached, but not later than April 14, 2007 and would then discontinue acceptance of waste for disposal in the landfill and undergo final closure in accordance with the requirements of current regulations. Activities on Bradley East would continue at their current levels in accordance with SWFP No. 19-AR-0004, which would not expire. Expansion of green/wood waste operations would not occur. When the landfill closes in 2007, solid waste currently handled at BLRC would be required to be disposed at other regional landfills. This MSW would require processing at another location for efficient transport to another landfill facility in order to avoid having packer trucks with their smaller loads travel long distances to landfills.

Alternative B: Reduced Transitional Vertical Expansion – 19’ Increase

Under Alternative B, the proposed transitional vertical increase would be reduced from the proposed 43-foot increase to a 19-foot increase. All other components of the proposed BLRC Transition Master Plan would remain the same. The proposed TS/MRF would be constructed, and green and wood waste and Phase I MRF operations would be expanded. Closure activities would take place on the landfill in accordance with regulatory requirements as soon as the capacity provided by the reduced transitional vertical expansion is reached, in any event, no later than April 14, 2007.

Alternative C: Reduced Transfer Station

Under Alternative C, the proposed TS/MRF capacity would be reduced by 25 percent, to a 3,000 tpd TS and 750 tpd MRF. All other components of the proposed BLRC Transition Master Plan would remain the same. Green and wood waste and Phase I MRF operations would be expanded. The proposed 43-foot transitional vertical increase would occur and closure activities would take place on the landfill in accordance with regulatory requirements as soon as the capacity provided by the transitional vertical expansion is reached, but no later than April 14, 2007.

Alternative D: Transfer Station Only, No Vertical Expansion

Under Alternative D, no transitional vertical expansion would occur within the landfill. The landfill would close and closure activities would be undertaken on the landfill in accordance with regulatory requirements as soon as the existing capacity is reached, but no later than April 14, 2007. All other components of the Proposed Project would remain the same. The proposed TS/MRF would be constructed, green and wood waste and Phase I MRF operations would be expanded.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The following pages summarize the various environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Project. Feasible mitigation measures are included to reduce impacts found to be significant, and the level of impact significance after mitigation is also identified.

**Table 1-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Impact After Mitigation
LAND USE/PLANNING		
<p>Impact 4.2-1: The Transitional Vertical Expansion of the Bradley Landfill would be generally compatible with the surrounding land uses. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>The Bradley Landfill is surrounded primarily by industrial uses (e.g., other landfills/gravel mines/industrial uses, and LADWP) and commercial uses. The nearest area zoned for residential uses is located approximately 350 feet away from the property boundary. The two closest residences to the property boundary are approximately 75 and 225 feet away in an area that is zoned for Industrial. The increase in the maximum height of the landfill would not change the operations and procedures of the existing landfill. Since no changes would occur in the procedures governing the operation of the landfill, the landfill would continue to be compatible with the immediately surrounding land uses.</p> <p>Impact 4.2-2: Construction of the proposed TS/MRF would be compatible with the surrounding land uses and would not generate any significant, unmitigatable impacts with respect to traffic, air quality, noise, and aesthetics. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>Construction activities associated with Phase I would occur approximately 700 feet from the nearest residence and is unlikely to be noticed with the exception of the increased truck traffic. Therefore, no land use compatibility impacts associated with the proposed TS/MRF construction are anticipated. While the proposed TS/MRF is compatible with the immediately surrounding land uses, some effects associated with the proposed TS/MRF would extend beyond those properties immediately adjacent to the landfill. Additionally, some of the effects from construction activities could extend beyond the boundaries of the Bradley Landfill. These issue areas include traffic, air quality, noise, aesthetics, and hazardous materials and are discussed in their respective sections.</p> <p>Impact 4.2-3: Phase I activities proposed for Bradley East are</p>	<p>Impact 4.2-1: No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>Impact 4.2-2: No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>Impact 4.2-3: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.2-1: Any potential land use impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.2-2: Any potential land use impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.2-3: Any</p>

<p>compatible with the existing, surrounding land uses and no impacts are anticipated as a result of these activities. (No Impact)</p> <p>The green/wood waste operation and the existing MRF operation would be expanded to accommodate additional quantities of material. The expansion of these operations would occur in the existing locations; however, no changes would occur in the way that they are operated. Therefore, no land use compatibility impacts are anticipated as a result of proposed activities on Bradley East under Phase I.</p> <p>Impact 4.2-4: Phase I of the Proposed Project would be generally consistent with the following adopted plans and policies: City of Los Angeles General Plan, SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, the LARWQCB Basin Plan, and the Los Angeles County Siting Element (Less Than Significant).</p> <p>Phase I of the proposed Master Plan would allow for the transitional vertical landfill expansion and the construction of a new 4,000 tpd transfer station and 1,000 tpd MRF adjacent to the existing landfill on Bradley West/West Extension. Proposed Phase I activities on Bradley East would include expansion of the existing green/wood waste operation and changes to the MRF operation. Consistency of these activities with the applicable plans and policies is discussed in Section 4.2. As discussed in Section 4.2, Phase I activities would be consistent with the General Plan, RCPG, Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board Basin Plan, and the Los Angeles Countywide Siting Element.</p> <p>Impact 4.2-5: Operation of the new TS/MRF and existing green/wood waste facility would not generate any land use compatibility impacts due to the distance of sensitive receptors from the operations and procedures currently in place to reduce impacts (Less Than Significant).</p> <p>The activities proposed under Phase II of the Proposed Project would not involve any new types of impacts that do not occur with the existing operational landfill. Procedures currently in place to reduce impacts to air quality, noise, geology and soils, hazards, etc., would continue to be utilized with Phase II of the proposed Master Plan. However, typical procedures for controlling odors at a landfill would not be appropriate for a transfer station</p>	<p>Impact 4.2-4: No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>Impact 4.2-5: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>potential land use impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.2-4: Any potential land use impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.2-5: Any potential land use impacts would be less than significant.</p>
--	---	---

<p>due to different operational constraints. The transfer station proposed under the Master Plan would be entirely enclosed and approximately 200 feet further away from the nearest sensitive receptors than the existing active landfill. Therefore, land use impacts from Phase II of the proposed Master Plan are anticipated to be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.2-6: Phase II of the Proposed Project would be generally consistent with the following adopted plans and policies: City of Los Angeles General Plan, SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, the LARWQCB Basin Plan, and the Los Angeles County Siting Element (Less Than Significant).</p> <p>Under Phase II, the TS/MRF would be operated replacing the existing landfill operation. The portions of the landfill that have not undergone closure would encompass activities associated with closing the landfill. Consistency of these activities with the applicable plans and policies is discussed in Section 4.2. As discussed in Section 4.2, Phase II activities would be consistent with the General Plan, RCPG, Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board Basin Plan, and the Los Angeles Countywide Siting Element.</p>	<p>Impact 4.2-6: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.2-6: Any potential land use impacts would be less than significant.</p>
<p>Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative land use impacts could occur if other related projects in the vicinity of the project site would result in land use incompatibility impacts in conjunction with the impacts of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would be compatible with the existing land uses and would implement important local and regional goals and policies for the City of Los Angeles, which would assist the City in achieving short- and long-term planning goals and objectives. Because the Proposed Project is compatible with the surrounding land uses and consistent with existing planning goals and objectives, it would not contribute towards any cumulative impact in the area. Therefore, land use impacts would thus not be cumulatively considerable.</p>		
<p>TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION</p>		
<p>Impact 4.3-1: The Proposed Project would generate additional traffic which could affect the existing traffic load and the capacity of the street</p>	<p>Impact 4.3-1: The following mitigation measures shall be in place or guaranteed satisfactorily to the City of Los Angeles prior to initiating each</p>	<p>Impact 4.3-1: Implementation of the</p>

<p>system serving the project area (Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated).</p> <p>The Phase I component of the proposed project is anticipated to generate 3,435 daily trips with 312 during the a.m. peak hour and 364 during the p.m. peak hour. This is expected to result in significant impacts at three study intersections. In addition to the increase in operations proposed under Phase I, construction of the proposed TS/MRF would occur during Phase I. Total import of soil required to construct the building pad for the TS/MRF is expected to be approximately 163,500 cubic yards. Site preparation for construction, including excavation and grading, will take about 83 days. With truckloads of about 16 cy per load, this will equate to approximately 120 truck loads, or 240 trips, of soil import per day.</p> <p>During the remainder of the construction period, lower traffic impacts would be expected to result from construction of the TS/MRF. An average of 30 to 35 truck deliveries per day would be expected (although 100 truck deliveries could occur on days when concrete is being poured). Following framing, a total of 30 to 50 construction workers would be at the project site. Trip generation associated with construction workers would be approximately 20-35 automobile trips during each of the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. The traffic volumes generated by the construction of this component of the Proposed Project would be temporary and short-term. Impacts would not exceed those that would result during the import of dirt.</p> <p>The Phase II construction is anticipated to generate approximately 4,399 daily trips with 406 during the a.m. peak hour and 405 during the p.m. peak hour. This is anticipated to result in significant impacts at four study intersections. At Project Completion it is anticipated that the project would generate approximately 3,960 daily trips with 365 during the a.m. peak hour and 367 during the p.m. peak hour. This is anticipated to result in significant impacts at three study intersections.</p> <p>Impact 4.3-2: The Proposed Project would generate additional traffic which could exceed a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency. (Less Than Significant)</p>	<p>phase of the proposed project.</p> <p>4.3-1 Bradley Avenue and Tuxford Street – Prohibit parking on the north side of Tuxford Street east of Bradley Avenue and on the south side of Tuxford Street west of Bradley Avenue to convert existing east and westbound lane configurations from left turn lane, through lane and shared through/right to a dedicated left turn lane, two through lanes, and dedicated right turn lane. Participate in the contribution towards funding for the ATSAC/ATCS signal system improvements.</p> <p>4.3-2 I-5 Southbound On/Off Ramps and Penrose Street – Design and install a new traffic signal at this currently unsignalized location. Caltrans approval will be required to implement this improvement.</p> <p>4.3-3 Bradley Avenue and Penrose Street – Convert existing single southbound left/through/right shared lane to a dedicated right-turn only lane and one through/right shared lane. Improve eastbound lane configurations from one left-turn only lane and one through lane to one left-turn only lane and one through/right shared lane.</p> <p>4.3-4 San Fernando Road and Sheldon Street – Participate in the contribution towards funding for the City of Los Angeles expanded signal system improvement where traffic signals are interconnected known as Automated Traffic Surveillance and Control (ATSAC)/Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS). This improvement provides for increased capacity at the intersection. The ATSAC/ATCS provides signal synchronization through monitoring upstream and downstream traffic volumes and delay. The synchronization is enhanced through computer enhancement and manual monitoring by a centralized control system.</p> <p>4.3-5 Glenoaks Boulevard and Tuxford Street – Participate in the contribution towards funding for the ATSAC/ATCS expanded signal system improvements.</p> <p>Impact 4.3-2: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>mitigation measures listed would reduce traffic-related impacts to less than significant levels for all phases: Phase I, Phase II Construction, and Project Completion</p> <p>Impact 4.3-2: Impacts with respect to the CMP Program would be less</p>
---	---	---

<p>All development projects which are required to prepare an EIR are subject to the Land Use Analysis of the CMP. This requirement will provide decision makers with the project specific traffic impacts created by large projects on the CMP highway network. The TIA to be included in an EIR requires that all freeway segments where the project adds 150 or more trips, in each direction, during the peak hours be analyzed. An analysis is also required at all CMP intersections where the project will add 50 or more trips during the peak hour. There are no CMP intersections where the project will add 50 or more trips in either direction during either the a.m. or p.m. peak hours. An analysis of freeway conditions on the Golden State Freeway, Hollywood, Antelope Valley, and Foothill Freeways in the vicinity of the project and potential routes was conducted. The freeway segments that were analyzed were chosen as the most likely to carry project-related traffic, based upon the project distribution of trips. In addition, as noted in Table 4.3-9, 95% of the transfer truck traffic associated with the proposed TS/MRF would utilize freeways to the north of the project site to transport waste to outlying landfills in the Antelope Valley.</p> <p>Based upon the 2003 Annual Average Daily Truck Traffic on the California State Highway System database prepared by Caltrans (2004), the percentage of trucks that are currently on the Golden State (I-5) and Antelope Valley (Hwy 14) Freeways ranges from 4.5% to 9.6%. The project will increase the number of trucks on these systems between 0.3% and 1.2%. The project does not increase the percentage of trucks on any of the segments more than 1.2%, which is less than the 2% significance criteria for overall traffic as identified by the CMP, and is not anticipated to result in significant regional impacts to any regional highway segment.. The Hollywood Freeway carries approximately 4.4% trucks daily, and the Foothill Freeway carries between 6.3% and 9.5% trucks daily in the vicinity of the project site. Less than 1% growth in trucks is anticipated on these two regional facilities due to the proposed project. The project would not cause or worsen a LOS F segment or increase traffic demand by two percent of capacity at LOS F for the freeway segments analyzed according to the CMP TIA requirements. Therefore, project impacts on these regional facilities would be less than significant.</p> <p>Approximately 5% of transfer truck traffic carrying waste from the proposed TS/MRF to be disposed at outlying landfills would arrive and depart from the south. This traffic represents disposal that would occur at</p>		<p>than significant.</p>
---	--	--------------------------

<p>the El Sobrante Landfill in Riverside County. A traffic study prepared for the expansion of this landfill in 1994 concluded that the proposed landfill expansion would not impact Interstate 15 or State Route 91, which provide regional access to the landfill. The study also found that all intersections, with the exception of I-15/Temescal Canyon Road would operate at acceptable levels of service with the project. Mitigation measures were identified at I-15/Temescal Canyon Road to reduce the project impact to less than significant. The traffic analysis conducted for the El Sobrante Landfill Expansion reflected that at least 50% of the waste disposed at El Sobrante would be generated outside Riverside County. Since the Proposed Project would not cause the tonnage limits at El Sobrante, upon which the traffic analysis for the expansion was based, the Proposed Project would not result in impacts to I-15, SR-91, Temescal Canyon Road and other roadways serving the El Sobrante Landfill as a result of transfer of waste from the BLRC TS/MRF for disposal at El Sobrante Landfill</p> <p>Impact 4.3-3: The proposed project could affect access or parking at the Proposed Project site (Less Than Significant).</p> <p>The current parking at the Waste Management offices is underutilized and will not be changed. However, approximately 17 additional parking spaces will be provided near the new TS/MRF structure in order to provide parking immediately adjacent to the building. This level of parking supply is more than adequate to meet the needs of the site.</p> <p>Currently, there are two driveways on Tujunga Avenue and one on Peoria Street which provide access to the Waste Management site. The Peoria Street driveway is used minimally for service of the gas plant. The northerly Tujunga Avenue driveway provides access to the landfill operations and internal roadways throughout the site. In addition, this access point provides scales which will continue to operate with the change to the TS operation. The southerly driveway on Tujunga Avenue provides access to the Waste Management office buildings. None of the driveways will be altered with the change in operation from a landfill to a TS/MRF. The driveways will continue to be used as the main access to the site. Thus, impacts related to parking and access would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Impact 4.3-3: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.3-3: Impacts with respect to parking and access would be less than significant.</p>
<p>Cumulative Impacts: The analysis of traffic impacts of the Proposed Project considers the effects of future growth in traffic in the region through consideration of traffic generated by 28 related projects and application of a 2% annual growth factor. Consequently, impacts of cumulative growth are already incorporated into the traffic model and are reflected in the Without Project condition in Tables 4.3-12, 4.3-13 and 4.3-14. Impacts of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with related projects, are shown in the With Project column in Tables</p>		

4.3-12, 4.3-13 and 4.3-14. As such, the Proposed Project's incremental effect with respect to traffic would be cumulatively considerable significant and mitigated through implementation of would be addressed by the mitigation measures identified for the project impacts under Impact 4.3-1, above. With implementation of these mitigation measures, cumulative traffic impacts at the study intersections would be less than significant during both Phase I and Phase II.

Similarly, the effects of cumulative growth on the freeway segments studied includes the cumulative effect of growth as the future conditions without project shown in Tables 4.3-16, 4.3-17 and 4.3-18 included projected traffic growth of 2% per year. Impacts on these freeway segments, including cumulative traffic growth would be less than significant.

AIR QUALITY

Impact 4.4-1: Phase I activities would generate emissions from the use of construction equipment as part of the construction of the proposed TS/MRF facility. (Significant)

Phase I construction emissions are expected from the following equipment and processes: construction equipment (dump trucks, backhoes, graders, etc.), equipment delivery/on-site travel, heavy diesel trucks (importing fill material), construction worker trips, and fugitive dust associated with site construction activities. Daily construction emissions were calculated for the peak construction day activities in Phase I. Peak day emissions are the sum of the highest daily emissions from employee vehicles, fugitive dust sources, construction equipment and transport activities for the construction period of the TS/MRF. The peak emissions were determined to be: 18 lbs/day VOC, 107 lbs/day CO, 137 lbs/day NO_x, 0.9 lbs/day SO_x, and 392 lbs/day PM₁₀. The emissions of NO_x and PM₁₀ would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds and would be significant. Emissions of all other criteria pollutants would be below SCAQMD thresholds and would be less than significant.

Impact 4.4-2: Phase I activities would generate additional criteria pollutant emissions from operational activities associated with the proposed transitional vertical expansion and increase in green and wood waste processing capacity and expanded MRF operations on Bradley East. (Significant)

Impact 4.4-1: The following feasible mitigation measures have been identified to avoid or reduce emissions associated with construction activities: These measures would also reduce PM_{2.5}.

- 4.4-1 Prior to beginning Phase I construction activities, the project applicant shall develop a Construction Emission Management Plan for the proposed project. The Plan shall include measures to minimize emissions from vehicles including, but not limited to: scheduling truck deliveries to avoid peak hour traffic conditions, consolidating truck deliveries, etc.
- 4.4-2 Use electricity or alternative fuel for on-site equipment to the extent feasible: for all other equipment use ultra low sulfur diesel fuel.
- 4.4-3 Maintain construction equipment tuned up and with two to four degree retard diesel engine timing.
- 4.4-4 Use on-site electricity rather than temporary power generators in portions of the landfill where electricity is available.
- 4.4-5 Use ultra low sulfur diesel (as defined in SCAQMD Rule 431.2).
- 4.4-6 Use construction equipment that meets EPA Tier I, II, or III emissions requirements.
- 4.4-7 Use CARB-verified particulate filter traps.
- 4.4-8 Pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 403, a Fugitive Dust Control Plan will be developed and implemented for the proposed project.

Impact 4.4-2: The following mitigation measures shall be required.

- 4.4-9 Use electricity or alternate fuels or low-sulfur diesel fuel for on-site mobile equipment to the extent feasible.
- 4.4-10 Investigate the technological feasibility of using a diesel oxidation catalyst or PM filter trap on an off-road device (i.e., construction

Impact 4.4-1: With implementation of the mitigation measures, the following would remain significant and unavoidable: NO_x and PM₁₀.

Impact 4.4-2: With implementation of the mitigation measures, the following would remain significant and unavoidable: VOC, NO_x

<p>The total additional operational emissions from the Phase I project are as follows: 74 lbs/day VOC, 314 lbs/day CO, 954 lbs/day NO_x, 4 lbs/day SO_x, and 187 lbs/day PM₁₀. Most of the emissions are associated with additional trips to the facility due to the additional landfill capacity. Other emissions are associated with the additional equipment associated with the expanded green/wood waste operations (including an additional electric grinder) and MRF. The emissions of VOC, NO_x, and PM₁₀ would exceed SCAQMD thresholds and would be significant. Emissions of all other criteria pollutants would be below SCAQMD thresholds and would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-3: During Phase I, construction activities and operational activities occurring concurrently would generate additional criteria pollutant emissions. (Significant)</p> <p>During Phase I, when construction of the TS/MRF is taking place, concurrent emissions from construction and operational activity would occur. The maximum emission levels projected to occur during Phase I, when all activities are taking place simultaneously are as follows: 92 lbs/day of VOC, 441 lbs/day of CO, 1,091 lbs/day of NO_x, 4.9 lbs/day of SO_x, and 579 lbs/day of PM₁₀. The maximum Phase I emissions of VOC, NO_x, and PM₁₀ would exceed SCAQMD thresholds and would be significant. Emissions of all other criteria pollutants would be below SCAQMD thresholds and would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-4: As a result of additional waste disposal during Phase I, additional landfill gas would be generated which would need to be accommodated by the landfill gas collection and control system presently operated at the landfill (Less Than Significant).</p> <p>The proposed transitional vertical expansion would be expected to generate additional volumes of landfill gas (LFG). The landfill is equipped with a LFG collection and control system that is constructed and operated in compliance with all applicable California Code of Regulations. The LFG system consists of a network of wells and collection piping and</p>	<p>equipment). Although most of these devices are not CARB-verified for off-road applications, the Applicant will conduct a technological feasibility analysis on one piece of equipment. If successful, the applicant will consider extending the program to 2008.</p> <p>4.4-11 Conduct a pilot study using a CARB-verified Diesel Particulate Filter that is also verified to reduce NO_x emissions on one refuse hauling truck.</p> <p>4.4-12 Maintain construction equipment tuned up and with two to four degree retard diesel engine timing during landfill operation and closure activities.</p> <p>4.4-13 Purchase and use an electric wood grinder in lieu of a traditional diesel grinder.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-3: Mitigation measures 4.4-1 through 4.4-13 would be applicable to emissions associated with the Proposed Project in Phase I.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-4: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>and PM₁₀.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-3: With implementation of the mitigation measures, the following would remain significant and unavoidable: VOC, NO_x and PM₁₀.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-4: Impacts associated with increased gas generation would be less than significant.</p>
--	---	---

<p>appurtenances. The LFG destruction/utilization system consists of three flares, five on-site engine generator sets and a gas compression plant, used to pump collected LFG off-site for use at the Penrose Gas Conversion, LLC power plant.</p> <p>A LFG recovery projection was prepared using USEPA's LandGEM model, which predicts gas generation based on characteristics of the landfill calibrated to the actual and historical results of the operation of the current system. The analysis demonstrates that the total destruction capacity of the existing LFG system (excluding the gas compressor plant) is 12,222 standard cubic feet per minute (scfm). Under the proposed transitional vertical expansion, the projected peak most likely recovery rate for LFG is 8,263 scfm in 2007 compared to 7,985 scfm in 2002 under the current permitted capacity, a modest 3.5% increase in gas generation. Even more conservative estimates have concluded that the highest likely recovery rate would be 9,641 scfm in 2007, which is also within the total destruction capacity of the system. Further, the SCAQMD sets permitting limits on both the flares and engines and restricts the amount of the gas that can be routed to any of these devices and the Proposed Project is not expected to result in any exceedances of these permit conditions. Therefore, impacts related to the generation of additional LFG under the proposed transitional vertical expansion would be well within the capacity of the existing LFG collection and control system and impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-5: As a result of additional waste disposal during Phase I, additional landfill gas would be generated that could impact the ability of the LFG collection and control system to control surface gas emissions. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>Not all LFG generated within a landfill is captured by the LFG collection system. The percentage of gas which is not captured is conventionally estimated at between 60% and 85% of the gas generated. The increase in landfill height will enhance the ability of the LFG collection system to capture generated gas. As is typical with landfills, there were some exceedances of the 500 ppmv instantaneous surface monitoring standards. In all but one case, adjustments were made to nearby wells and/or the nearby surface soils were reworked and the exceedance was corrected. This is the normal detection/modification cycle of instantaneous monitoring. In the remaining case, the exceedance continued until additional vertical wells were installed and then the exceedance ceased. No integrated samples</p>	<p>Impact 4.4-5: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.4-5: Impacts associated with increased gas generation would be less than significant.</p>
--	--	--

<p>through the year exceeded the 50 ppmv standard within a grid. This suggests that the control system is capable of successfully limiting surface emissions.</p> <p>Since the LFG collection system has the capacity to handle the modest amount of additional gas generated by the additional waste that would be deposited under the proposed transitional vertical expansion, and since additional refuse height enhances the capability of the system to collect gas, the analysis concluded that the additional waste permitted under the proposed transitional vertical expansion would not adversely impact the ability of the existing LFG collection system to control surface emissions. Impacts related to surface gas emissions would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-6: Phase I activities would generate additional traffic, which would have the potential to increase localized CO concentrations at intersections near the project site. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>Project related traffic during Phase I could cause increased CO concentrations at area intersections as a result of increased traffic congestion. CO concentrations at the six study intersections analyzed with and without the project range from 3.7 to 8.2 ppm. None of the intersections would experience CO concentrations that exceed the State standard. Impacts related to local CO concentrations would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-7: Phase I would include additional waste disposal in the landfill and in increase in green and wood waste processing which would have the potential to generate odors. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>The proposed increase in landfilling and green and wood waste processing that would occur under the proposed transitional vertical expansion (Phase I) would not be expected to generate any additional odors at the facility. The landfill comes equipped with odor prevention devices and maintenance practices. These systems and practices would continue to be operated under the proposed transitional vertical expansion. Other factors that will reduce the potential for odors include the location of disposal activities within the landfill prior to its closure. Landfilling would not occur on the slopes of the landfill, the area closest to off-site sensitive receptors. Landfill operations taking place under the proposed transitional vertical expansion will be</p>	<p>Impact 4.4-6: No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-7: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.4-6: Impacts associated with increased localized CO concentrations during Phase I would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-7: Impacts associated with potential odors would be less than significant.</p>
---	---	--

<p>confined to the highest top deck area. In addition, the odor Best Management Practices for the green and wood waste operation would continue to be implemented in conjunction with the increased green and wood waste processing capacity. Because of these factors, the proposed project would not substantially increase the likelihood that odors would be generated that would cause a nuisance affecting a considerable number of persons or the public and impacts of the proposed transitional vertical expansion and increase in green and wood waste processing with respect to odors would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-8: Phase II activities would generate emissions from the use of construction equipment to complete final closure of the landfill. (Significant)</p> <p>Landfill closure activities are included in Phase II and would include the installation of a final cover using construction equipment. Upon completion of the final dirt cover, vegetation will be planted on all slopes as well as landfill cap; surface water control structures will be built as well as the final transition of the landfill to an end use. Emissions from construction activities would be temporary in nature, occurring only during time frames when landfill closure activities are actively taking place. Peak day construction emissions associated with landfill closure activities that would occur under Phase II of the Proposed Project are anticipated to be as follows: 18 lbs/day of VOC, 93 lbs/day of CO, 215 lbs/day of NO_x, 0 lbs/day of SO_x, and 140 lbs/day of PM₁₀. Emissions of NO_x would exceed SCAQMD thresholds and would be significant. Emissions of all other criteria pollutants would be below SCAQMD thresholds and would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-9: During Phase II, additional criteria pollutant emissions would be generated from operational activities, including continuing the expanded green and wood waste operation and operating the new TS/MRF. (Significant)</p> <p>The bulk of operational emissions at the facility result from increased truck travel. The CARB established a law in 2004 that targeted emissions from refuse-carrying trucks. The CARB regulation requires trucks to be retrofitted based on make and model year. Mandated reductions are either 25% or 80% for PM10 depending upon the model year of the engine. As</p>	<p>Impact 4.4-8: Mitigation measures 4.4-1 through 4.4-8 would apply to landfill closure activities.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-9: Mitigation measures 4.4-9 through 4.4-13 would apply to Phase II operational emissions.</p>	<p>Impact 4.4-8: With implementation of the mitigation measures, the following would remain significant and unavoidable: NO_x.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-9: With implementation of the mitigation measures, the following would remain significant and unavoidable: NO_x.</p>
--	---	---

<p>such, emissions will continue to decline from this source category as these fleets are turned over and replaced with newer, cleaner models.</p> <p>Emissions would be associated with the additional equipment as well as the associated trips after April 2007, when the landfill would close. The total additional operations emissions projected to result from Phase II are anticipated to be 46 lbs/day VOC, 287 lbs/day CO, 567 lbs/day NO_x, 3 lbs/day SO_x, and 114 lbs/day PM₁₀. Emissions of NO_x would exceed SCAQMD thresholds and would be significant. Emissions of all other criteria pollutants would be below SCAQMD thresholds and would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-10: During Phase II, landfill closure activities and operational activities occurring concurrently would generate additional criteria pollutant emissions. (Significant)</p> <p>During Phase II (April 2007 through April 2008), when construction activity associated with landfill closure is taking place, concurrent emissions from construction activity and operational activity would occur. The maximum emission levels projected to occur during this time frame are as follows: 64 lbs/day of VOC, 380 lbs/day of CO, 782 lbs/day of NO_x, 3 lbs/day of SO_x, and 254 lbs/day of PM₁₀. The maximum Phase II emissions of VOC, NO_x, and PM₁₀ would exceed SCAQMD thresholds and would be significant. Emissions of all other criteria pollutants would be below SCAQMD thresholds and would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-11: Phase II activities would have the potential to generate toxic air contaminants from the operation of diesel trucks. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>A Health Risk Assessment (HRA) was prepared to identify potential air toxic impacts to the community from operation of diesel-fueled solid waste collection vehicles (SWCV) at the proposed Bradley TS/MRF. This HRA follows the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)</p>	<p>Impact 4.4-10: Mitigation measures 4.4-1 through 4.4-13 would be applicable to emissions associated with the Proposed Project in Phase II.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-11: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.4-10: With implementation of the mitigation measures, the following would remain significant and unavoidable: VOC, NO_x and PM₁₀.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-11: Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
--	--	--

guidance *Risk Assessment Procedures for Rules 1401 and 212 (Version 7.0, July 1, 2005)*. Modeling was performed using the Industrial Source Complex – Short Term (ISCST-3) air dispersion model as required by SCAQMD. To calculate air concentrations for the HRA analyses, air dispersion modeling was completed using one year of SCAQMD pre-processed meteorological data from the Burbank Station and the ISCST3 model.

Maximum hourly and annual average air concentrations were calculated for each receptor using a nominal emission rate of 1 gram per second. The resulting concentrations at the maximum offsite location, maximum offsite worker, and maximum residential receptor were then entered into a spreadsheet to calculate the health risks, using SCAQMD’s Rule 1401 methodology.

SCAQMD has not established a specific risk threshold for mobile sources. SCAQMD Rule 1401 regulates permitting of new stationary source emission sources. This rule allows permits for cancer risk up to 10 in one million as long as the equipment has Best Available Control Technology for Toxics (T-BACT). Refuse trucks are currently regulated by CARB and CARB requires retrofits over time to reduce PM₁₀ emissions by at least 85%. SCAQMD recently adopted a rule requiring rail yards to notify the public if the risk from facility emissions exceeds 10 in one million. Taking all of these factors into account, the HRA utilized the SCAQMD standard of 10 in one million for new sources as a conservative threshold for identifying significant impacts.

Based on the conservative estimate of the maximum emissions generated by trucks utilized the TS/MRF, the potential impacts to the nearest offsite worker and nearest residence were calculated. The maximum impact for an offsite worker was a predicted cancer risk of 3.02 in one million. The maximum impact at a residence was a predicted cancer risk of 3.20 in one million.

Non-carcinogenic effects are expressed via an Acute Hazard Index and a Chronic Hazard Index. The State of California provides a Reference Exposure Level (REL) which must be used as an indicator of potential adverse non-cancer health effects. An REL is a concentration level ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) or dose (mg/kg-day) at which no adverse health effects are anticipated.

<p>When emissions of several TACs are quantified from a specific activity, and they affect the same organ system in the body (e.g., respiratory system, nervous system, reproductive system, etc.), there could be a cumulative effect on the target organ. In these cases, the cumulative hazard index is evaluated. The chronic HI is based upon an annual average emission per year whereas the acute HI is based upon a maximum one-hour emission level.</p> <p>For both acute and chronic exposures, a total HI of 1 (i.e., the concentrations/dosage of TACs exceed the concentration/dosage at which no adverse health effects are anticipated) at any target organ is considered a significance threshold. Chemical concentrations, determined from modeling, are evaluated relative to their respective RELs for each organ and compared to a HI of 1. Based on the analysis of diesel truck emissions, the maximum HI for the nearest resident is 0.029 and the maximum HI for the nearest offsite worker is 0.017, both of which are well below the significance threshold of 1.0. As such, impacts related to non-cancer risks resulting from the proposed project would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-12: Phase II activities would generate additional traffic, which would have the potential to increase localized CO concentrations at intersections near the project site. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>Project-related traffic during Phase II could also cause increased CO concentrations at area intersections as a result of increased traffic congestion. However, the amount of traffic generated by the project during Phase II would be less than the traffic generated during Phase I. As a result, the CO concentrations anticipated during Phase II would be less than Phase I. The CO concentrations during Phase I would not exceed the State or federal standards. Therefore, impacts related to CO concentrations during Phase II would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-13: Phase II would include handling of solid waste in the TS/MRF which would have the potential to generate odors. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>The proposed TS/MRF is not expected to generate any additional odors because transfer activities which could generate potential odors would take place within an enclosed building designed to mitigate odors. The MRF is</p>	<p>Impact 4.4-12: No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-13: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.4-12: Impacts associated with localized CO concentrations during Phase II would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.4-13: Impacts</p>
---	---	---

<p>expected to handle curbside recyclables such as paper, glass, and aluminum. The general characteristics of these materials do not lend themselves to generation of odors. The TS/MRF building will be equipped with exhaust fans to provide six air exchanges every hour. The air leaving the building at the roof exhaust fans will be treated by an odor neutralizing misting system to mitigate odors. Negative pressure will be maintained at the building entrance so no untreated air will leave the building. An odor neutralizer may be mixed with dust control water in the ceiling mounted misting systems for extra odor mitigation as needed. As such, because of the design of the facility, no substantial increase in the likelihood that odors would be generated that would cause a nuisance affecting a considerable number of persons or the public would occur and impacts of the proposed TS/MRF with respect to odors would be less than significant.</p>		<p>related to odors during Phase II activities would be less than significant.</p>
<p>Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative air quality and health risk impacts would occur to the extent that criteria and toxic pollutant emissions generated by the Proposed Project combine with emissions from other new and/or ongoing sources in the vicinity. A total of 29 related projects are included in this EIR. As discussed in Section 4.4 of this EIR, the SCAB is presently designated non-attainment of State and Federal standards for CO, ozone, and PM₁₀. Total daily air emissions from activities occurring on the project site during Phase I and Phase II of the Proposed Project would exceed SCAQMD thresholds for VOCs, NO_x, and PM₁₀ and would be significant. The 29 related projects would also contribute VOC, NO_x, and PM₁₀ emissions into the SCAB. Therefore, the Proposed Project and the related projects would contribute to significant cumulative air quality impacts.</p> <p>While individual project emissions exceed the SCAQMD thresholds on a localized level, overall the project has the potential to reduce emissions across the SCAB. Materials no longer transported to Bradley, must be disposed of at other municipal and private landfill sites throughout Southern California. Potential disposal sites are as much as 120 miles away from Bradley therefore, contributing to emissions across the Basin. As such, the additional disposal capacity that would be provided under Phase I of the Proposed Project would result in reduced regional emissions by offering the potential to reduce these trip lengths. In addition, the additional transfer capacity that would be provided in Phase II of the Proposed Project would potentially reduce trip lengths by allowing loads to be consolidated for transfer to outlying landfills. Finally, continued compliance with CARB regulations requiring reduction in emissions from trash vehicles and the applicant's programs to convert its fleet to low emissions fuels and alternative fuels would result in long-range benefits to regional air quality over the course of the Proposed Project.</p> <p>The analysis of local CO concentration impacts associated with implementation of the Proposed Project considers the effects of growth in traffic associated with the Proposed Project and the related projects listed in Section 2.0. Consequently, impacts of cumulative growth are already incorporated into the projections utilized to model the future CO concentrations. As indicated, impacts of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with related project and other regional growth with respect to CO concentrations would not exceed state or federal standards and would therefore be less than significant.</p>		
<p>NOISE</p>		
<p>Impact 4.5-1: The proposed transitional vertical expansion would result in the operation of additional equipment that would generate noise that could be perceived at nearby sensitive receptors. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>Under the proposed transitional vertical expansion, the same equipment</p>	<p>Impact 4.5-1: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.5-1: Impacts from noise associated with the vertical expansion of the landfill would be less than significant.</p>

<p>would be utilized as under the existing operation, with the addition of one bulldozer and one compactor. Maximum noise levels that would be generated by the simultaneous operation of all equipment during Phase I landfill operations would be approximately 92.3 dBA. The increase in the maximum noise level of all equipment operating simultaneously would be 2.0 dBA. This increase in noise level would be reduced by attenuation at nearby sensitive receptors. Moreover, equipment use would occur to the center of the transitional vertical expansion area, which would increase the distance from the equipment to the nearby sensitive receptors. There would be no potential for audible increase (i.e., 3 dBA) at sensitive receptors from the proposed vertical expansion.</p> <p>Impact 4.5-2: Construction of the proposed TS/MRF would result in the operation of construction equipment that would generate noise that could be perceived at nearby sensitive receptors. (Significant)</p> <p>Construction of the proposed TS/MRF would involve the use of construction equipment. The highest noise levels from construction equipment are generated during the grading/excavation phase (86 dBA at 50 feet). In addition, construction of the proposed TS/MRF would involve importation of approximately 163,500 cy of fill dirt, involving approximately 120 trucks per day for 83 working days. When the noise impacts of these trucks are added to the noise levels generated by construction equipment, a source level of approximately 89 dBA at 50 feet would be generated. Based on the conservative assessment of sound attenuation, the noise level experienced at the nearest residential area would be approximately 67 dBA. This level would represent an increase of 14 dBA over the existing ambient level at this location. As such, the noise associated with the proposed construction of the TS/MRF would be significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.5-3: The proposed green and wood waste expansion would result in the operation of additional equipment that would generate noise that could be perceived at nearby sensitive receptors. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>The proposed expansion of existing wood and green waste operations in</p>	<p>Impact 4.5-2: The following mitigation measures shall be employed during construction of the TS/MRF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.5-1 Construction contracts shall specify that all construction equipment must be equipped with mufflers and other applicable noise attenuation devices. 4.5-2 Construction shall be restricted to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Saturday and prohibited at anytime on Sunday or a Federal holiday. 4.5-3 Temporary plywood noise barriers shall be constructed along the BLRC property line on San Fernando Road between the TS/MRF construction site and residential area located west of San Fernando Road. Plywood shall be installed to the height necessary to block the line of sight between the construction site and the nearest residential unit to the construction site. Plywood shall be a minimum of one-half inch thick, in order to provide a minimum 10 dB reduction in noise levels between the construction activity and the receptor. <p>Impact 4.5-3: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.5-2: With implementation of the listed mitigation measure, noise impacts associated with the construction of the TS/MRF would remain significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>Impact 4.5-3: Impacts associated with the green and wood waste facility processing expansion would be less than significant.</p>
--	---	---

<p>Phase I would result in an increase in equipment utilization of one conveyor sort line, one grinder, one trammel screen, and two loaders. The maximum noise level generated by the simultaneous operation of all equipment was calculated and would increase noise levels by 2.9 dBA. This increase in noise level would be further reduced by attenuation at nearby sensitive receptors. As such, there would be no potential for an audible increase at sensitive receptors to result from the proposed green and would waste processing facility expansion and impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.5-4: The proposed Phase I MRF operation would result in the operation of additional equipment that would generate noise that could be perceived at nearby sensitive receptors. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>The proposed expansion of the existing MRF would involve the use of one additional conveyor sort line. The maximum noise level generated by the simultaneous operation of all equipment was calculated and the maximum increase in noise levels would be approximately 0.5 dBA. This increase in noise level would be further reduced by attenuation at nearby sensitive receptors. As such, these receptors would experience an increase of less than 0.5 dBA as a result of expanded MRF operations. There would be no potential for an audible increase in noise levels at sensitive receptors as a result of the proposed expansion of the existing MRF. Impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.5-5: Simultaneous operation of all equipment during Phase I would generate noise that could be perceived at nearby sensitive receptors. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>During Phase I, all activities could operate simultaneously with maximum utilization of all equipment. The maximum noise level generated by the simultaneous operation of all additional equipment that could potentially be utilized during Phase I could increase noise levels approximately 1.8 dBA. This increase in noise level would be further reduced by attenuation at nearby sensitive receptors. As such, these receptors would experience an increase of less than 1.8 dBA as a result of all Phase I operations. There would be no potential for an audible increase in noise levels as perceived at sensitive receptors to result from all activities that could occur under Phase I and impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Impact 4.5-4: No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>Impact 4.5-5: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.5-4: Impacts associated with the expansion of the existing MRF operations would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.5-5: Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
---	---	--

<p>Impact 4.5-6: Proposed Phase I activities would generate additional traffic that could change the noise environment at nearby sensitive receptors. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>Three roadway segments were selected for analysis of traffic noise. The roadway segments were selected based upon locations of residential communities in the vicinity of the project site. The CNEL predictions were based upon the p.m. peak hour traffic volumes, which were determined to be of greater volume. The maximum project-related noise increase would be below the 3 dBA threshold of audibility identified in the L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide and the Proposed Project would not cause the ambient noise level to increase to the “normally unacceptable” category for residential land uses. Impacts related to traffic noise in Phase I would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.5-7: Operation of the proposed TS/MRF could generate noise that could be perceived at nearby sensitive receptors. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>Operation of the proposed TS/MRF would involve different equipment than is utilized for the landfill operation. When the landfill closes and the TS/MRF opens, the use of earth moving equipment on the landfill for solid waste processing would cease and would be replaced by equipment required to handle solid waste and recyclables, which would include up to four wheeled loaders, two forklifts, and two balers. In addition, the existing/expanded MRF would close and operations would transfer to the new TS/MRF. This would result in a net increase of one conveyor sort line. The average noise level generated by the simultaneous operation of all equipment would be approximately 91.7 dBA. However, this equipment would be operated within the proposed TS/MRF structure, which would be completely enclosed and would reduce the noise levels experienced outside the structure by at least 20 dBA, to 71.7 dBA. This noise level would be reduced by attenuation to approximately 49 dBA at the nearest residential use (i.e., the conforming residential area located to the southwest of the</p>	<p>Impact 4.5-6: No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>Impact 4.5-7: In order to ensure that the assumption of a 20 dBA increase used in the analysis of TS/MRF operational noise is valid, the following mitigation measure shall be employed for the TS/MRF building design:</p> <p>4.5-4 The applicant shall document to the Department of Building and Safety that the wall and roof panels in the TS/MRF building provide at least 20 dBA noise attenuation for the lowest sound frequencies associated with the equipment to be utilized within the building.</p>	<p>Impact 4.5-6: Impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.5-7: Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
--	---	---

<p>project site, Sensitive Receptor #3). As such, the operation of the projected mix of equipment within the new TS/MRF building would not be audible at the nearest residential area to the project site and impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.5-8: Final landfill closure activities would involve operation of additional equipment that would generate noise that could be perceived at nearby sensitive receptors. (Significant)</p> <p>During operations associated with landfill closure, equipment utilization would consist of one bulldozer, three compactors, four scrapers, two motor graders and two water trucks. The average noise level generated by the simultaneous operation of all equipment would be approximately 91.7 dBA. This noise level would be reduced by attenuation to approximately 82 dBA at the nearest non-conforming residential unit. This noise level would be approximately 17 dBA higher than the measured ambient noise level of 65 dBA. The noise level associated with landfill closure would be reduced by attenuation to 70 dBA at the nearest conforming residential use, which would be 17 dBA above the ambient noise level for this area. These increases would be above the City’s threshold of significance for construction activity (increase of 5 dBA). As such, the noise associated with landfill closure activities would be significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.5-9: Proposed Phase II activities would generate additional traffic that could change the noise environment at nearby sensitive receptors. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>During landfill closure activities the maximum project related noise increase would be below the 3 dBA threshold of audibility identified in the L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide and the Proposed Project would not cause the ambient noise level to increase to the “normally unacceptable” category for residential land uses. Impacts related to traffic noise during Phase II landfill closure operations would be less than significant.</p> <p>After landfill closure, the maximum project related noise increase would be below the 3 dBA threshold of audibility identified in the L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide and the Proposed Project would not cause the ambient noise level to increase to the “normally unacceptable” category for residential land uses. Impacts related to traffic noise after Phase II landfill closure operations would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Impact 4.5-8: Mitigation measures 4.5-1 through 4.5-3 would be applicable to construction activity associated with landfill closure and installation of final cover. Plywood barriers shall be a minimum of one-half inch thick, in order to provide a minimum of 10 dB reduction in noise levels between the construction activity and the receptor.</p> <p>Impact 4.5-9: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.5-8: With implementation of the mitigation measures, impacts associated with landfill closure would be significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>Impact 4.5-9: Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
---	--	--

<p>Cumulative Impacts: Noise from construction activity associated with the construction of the proposed TS/MRF would increase noise levels in the immediate vicinity of the construction site. Potential cumulative effects resulting from the incremental effect of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with related projects' construction activity occurring in the same area, and at the same time, as the Proposed Project could occur to the extent that high noise level events associated with these activities were to overlap. To the extent that this occurs, construction noise impacts would be cumulatively considerable. However, such effects would be temporary and limited to any time period in which high noise-generating activity overlaps on two or more projects that are located in close proximity to one another.</p> <p>Cumulative operational traffic noise impacts would occur to the extent that the roadways within the project area were to experience an audible increase in noise levels (i.e., 3.0 dBA or greater) with resulting noise levels at or within in the "unacceptable" category as a result of traffic increases associated with the Proposed Project and other growth expected to occur in the area. The model used to assess potential traffic impacts of the Proposed Project, upon which the assessment of traffic noise impacts was based, included the traffic associated with the related projects listed in Section 2.0 of this EIR, along with a background growth factor that accounts for other projected traffic growth that would use the streets in the area. The maximum increase between existing noise levels (Table 4.5-4) and projected 2012 noise levels (4.5-11) would be 1.4 dBA on San Fernando Road between Tuxford Street and Sheldon Street, which would not exceed the 3 dBA threshold for an audible increase. As such, traffic noise impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>		
<p>AESTHETICS/VIEWS</p>		
<p>Impact 4.6-1: The increase in height of the landfill by 43 feet during Phase I would not significantly impact the view of the project site from the surrounding area (Less Than Significant).</p> <p>Implementation of Phase I of the Proposed Project would raise the maximum height of the landfill by 43 feet to 1,053 feet above msl. The appearance of the landfill would be similar to its present condition; only higher. The look of the landfill would not change with the implementation of Phase I of the Proposed Project. More of the mound of dirt would be visible above the fencing and vegetation. The landfill would still be fenced, the finished slopes would be landscaped, and the landfill would continue to implement the required measures in the approved Zone Variance. The areas where the TS/MRF, and expanded green/wood waste and MRF area are located would not be visible from the area immediately outside of the project site. These areas are visible from Shadow Hills, but would have a visual appearance similar to the existing site.</p> <p>Impact 4.6-2: The increase in height of the landfill by 43 feet during Phase I would significantly impact the available views from some locations in the surrounding areas. (Significant)</p> <p>Using visual simulation software, the final proposed grade of the landfill was superimposed on photographs taken from various locations around the</p>	<p>Impact 4.6-1: No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>Impact 4.6-2: No mitigation measures are available that would reduce the significant impacts associated with the blockage of views from the closure of the landfill at the increased height.</p>	<p>Impact 4.6-1: Impacts associated with views of the project site from the surrounding area would be less than significant. .</p> <p>Impact 4.6-2: Impacts associated with the blockage of views would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>

<p>landfill. The resulting photograph depicted what the view of the landfill is anticipated to be when it reaches its maximum height of 1,053 feet above msl for each location. The views from three of the eight locations would be significantly impacted as a result of the proposed height increase. They are identified as Locations 3, 4, and 8 and are all located south of the existing landfill.</p> <p>Impact 4.6-3: No new sources of light would occur as a result of the increased height of the landfill or the construction of the new TS/MRF or the expansion of the existing greenwaste area. New sources of glare may be introduced from the construction of the TS/MRF, but the facility would be hidden from view. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>No substantial increase in on-site lighting is anticipated with implementation of Phase I of the Proposed Project. With the vertical expansion of the landfill and the expansion of the existing greenwaste area, the practice of portable light fixtures is anticipated to continue. As needed, portable lighting fixtures would be placed in areas where active work was ongoing. This lighting would continue to be shielded and directed on-site and would not increase the lighting levels experienced by off-site receptors. Additionally, no permanent lighting fixtures would be placed by the administrative office or parking lots. Construction of the TS/MRF would occur during the daylight hours and would not require the placement of any temporary/portable lighting fixtures. The area of the landfill where the TS/MRF would be placed is not visible from most of the surrounding area but may be visible from San Fernando Road. Since no additional lighting sources would be utilized during construction activities, no lighting impacts would occur.</p> <p>No additional sources of glare would be introduced with the increase in the height of the existing landfill. Some glare may be experienced from the trash trucks driving to the working face of the landfill as well as equipment operating at the working face. However, this would be the same as the glare currently experienced from existing operations. Construction of the TS/MRF may introduce new sources of glare, including the metal siding of the facility. However, this facility would be hidden from view from the surrounding land uses and would not represent a new source of glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Therefore, impacts from glare would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Impact 4.6-3: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.6-3: Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
--	--	---

<p>Impact 4.6-4: Complete closure of the landfill at the increased height would significantly impact the views available of the surrounding area. (Significant)</p> <p>The maximum height of the landfill upon complete closure would be 1,053 feet msl. This height is identical to the maximum height of the landfill under the expansion in Phase I. The available views of the landfill and the surrounding area would be the same as those impacts discussed under Phase I. Upon closure of the landfill, the landfill would be vegetated with shrubs and plant cover according to the conditions outlined in the zoning variance discussed above. This would add some visual relief to the views of the large mound of dirt. Subsequent to landfill closure, natural settlement would occur which would reduce the elevation of the landfill cap. However, the closed landfill would still block views of the surrounding mountains from the area located south of San Fernando Road. Therefore, impacts to views of and through the project site would continue to be significant though Phase II of the Master Plan.</p> <p>The operation of the TS/MRF would not be directly visible from any of the locations surrounding the landfill. Additionally, the facility is constructed of metal and would have a look similar to other industrial facilities in the area. Therefore, aesthetic impacts associated with the operation of the TS/MRF would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.6-5: Lighting from the operation of the transfer station could be visible from the surrounding area and may increase the overall lighting conditions in the area. (Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated)</p> <p>No substantial increase in on-site lighting is anticipated with implementation of Phase II of the Proposed Project. Currently, the parking lots and other areas around the administrative office are equipped with pole or wall mounted lighting for safety and security purposes. These light sources would remain in place as the administrative offices would continue to be utilized with the operation of the TS/MRF. The TS/MRF would have either permanent lighting or portable lighting fixtures to facilitate operations after daylight hours. The lighting would primarily be outdoor security lighting aimed at the employee parking area and around the</p>	<p>Impact 4.6-4: The proposed project would continue to comply with the conditions and measures identified in Zone Variance 94-0792(ZV)(PAD), issued June 2, 1998. The landscaping plan for the project site upon closure of landfilling operations would be included in the Final Closure Plan. No mitigation measures are available that would reduce the significant impacts associated with the blockage of views from the closure of the landfill at the increased height.</p> <p>Impact 4.6-5: The following mitigation measure shall be required to address the potentially significant lighting impacts from the operation of the TS/MRF.</p> <p>4.6-1 New lighting sources shall be shielded to direct light downward and onto the project site and not toward the sky to minimize atmospheric light pollution.</p>	<p>Impact 4.6-4: Impacts with respect to the blockage of views would remain significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>Impact 4.6-5: With implementation of the listed mitigation measure, impacts would be less than significant.</p>
---	--	---

<p>facility. This lighting may be visible from San Fernando Road and could increase the lighting conditions in the general area. Lighting impacts of the TS/MRF would be potentially significant.</p> <p>No additional sources of glare would be introduced with the increase in the height of the existing landfill. Some glare may be experienced from the trash trucks driving to the TS/MRF. However, this would be no more than the amount of glare currently experienced from existing operations. Therefore, Phase II activities would not result in new sources of substantial glare that could adversely affect day or nighttime views of the area and impacts from glare would be less than significant.</p>		
<p>Cumulative Impacts: As discussed in Section 2.0, Related Projects 28 related projects have been identified in the vicinity of the Proposed Project. The uses associated with these projects include industrial, recreational, residential, retail, and school uses. Implementation of the Proposed Project in conjunction with the related projects could result in cumulative changes to the visual environment in the areas surrounding the project site. However, none of these uses are located in the immediate vicinity of the BLRC. Additionally, development of the related projects would be consistent with the height and mass of existing urban development in this area. Cumulative impacts with regard to the aesthetic and urban design appearance would be consistent with the urban character of the area and would not be cumulatively considerable.</p> <p>Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a significant impact with respect to view blockage. However, the related projects would not result in the blockage of views of the surrounding area. Therefore, the view blockage impacts of the Proposed Project would not be expected to combine with the impacts associated with the related projects and such impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.</p> <p>Implementation of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with the related projects, could increase ambient lighting and glare levels in the vicinity of the project site. These light sources, primarily for safety and security, would be focused on their respective sites and could contribute to small increases in the ambient glow of the area. Additionally, these related projects could slightly increase the amount of glare in the area from building materials and increased vehicle activity. However, because ambient lighting levels in this area are already high, the impacts of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with the related projects, would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>		
<p>GEOLOGY/SOILS</p>		
<p>Impact 4.7-1: The proposed vertical expansion of the landfill could increase the potential for soil erosion to occur (Significant).</p> <p>Washout of cover materials/waste could result from inadequate drainage, particularly uncontrolled high-velocity flows. Earthwork associated with landfilling activities exposes areas of bare earth and loose soil to wind and</p>	<p>Impact 4.7-1: The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce potentially significant wind-borne erosion impacts.</p> <p>4.7-1 All soil disturbance and travel on unpaved surfaces shall be suspended if winds exceed 25 miles per hour.</p> <p>4.7-2 Mitigation measures defined in Section 4.4, Air Quality, of</p>	<p>Impact 4.7-1: With implementation of the listed mitigation measures, impacts related to wind-borne soil erosion would be less than</p>

<p>water erosion. These, in turn, could result in an incremental increase in debris loading and siltation of downstream drainage conveyances.</p> <p>Because the landfill footprint is not changing and there are no proposed excavation areas or changes to operational landfilling procedures, no new drainage control measures are needed. Construction and extension of existing landfill slopes upward will be accommodated by additional benching and extension of existing down drains. Existing drainage and erosion control measures will continue to be implemented to mitigate the erosion and siltation potential at the project site. Use of such existing drainage and erosion control measures would ensure that any water-borne erosion impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>In addition, activities associated with the movement of soil in conjunction with continuing landfill operations as part of the transitional vertical expansion could expose soils to potential wind-borne erosion. Therefore, the potential for wind-borne erosion associated with the proposed transitional vertical expansion would be significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.7-2: The proposed transitional vertical expansion of the landfill could cause increased slope instability (Less Than Significant).</p> <p>Grading operations at the existing landfill are required to conform to requirements of the City’s Building Code related to assuring the stability of engineered slopes. In addition, slope construction is required to be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Final Grading Plan which will be submitted along with a slope stability analysis as part of the Joint Technical Document (JTD) for the SWFP revision. These requirements would continue to apply to operations on the landfill under the proposed increase in maximum permitted height. Therefore, these activities would not occur on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in collapse. Impacts related to slope stability resulting from the proposed transitional vertical expansion of the landfill would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.7-3: Construction activities associated with the TS/MRF could expose soils to potential erosion. (Significant)</p> <p>Activities associated with the movement of soil required to construct the</p>	<p>this EIR related to site watering and watering of unpaved roads would also address impacts related to wind-borne erosion.</p> <p>Impact 4.7-2: No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>Impact 4.7-3: Mitigation measures 4.7-1 and 4.7-2 shall be implemented during construction of the TS/MRF to reduce potentially significant wind-</p>	<p>significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.7-2: Impacts associated with slope stability would be less than significant</p> <p>Impact 4.7-3: Impacts with respect to wind-</p>
--	--	--

<p>proposed TS/MRF could expose soils to potential wind- and water-borne erosion. Therefore, the potential for wind-borne erosion during construction of the proposed TS/MRF would be significant. There is also potential for erosion to occur during the grading process during periods of heavy precipitation. Construction of the proposed TS/MRF would result in potentially significant impacts related to water-borne erosion. These impacts would be addressed through adherence to the requirements of the General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit that applies to all construction projects involving sites of one acre or greater.</p> <p>Impact 4.7-4: Construction activities associated with the TS/MRF could result in slope instability on the project site (Less Than Significant).</p> <p>The TS/MRF facility would be located within the facility boundaries of the existing BLRC, on the west side of the existing landfill in a reclaimed sand and gravel mine. Approximately 163,500 cubic yards of fill dirt would be imported to fill the sand and gravel pit and provide an engineered base for the concrete slab foundation. All grading activities would be required to occur under a grading permit issued by the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety, in the process of fulfilling its ministerial responsibilities under the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code, and would conform to the requirements of the City's Building Code. As part of the final design for the TS/MRF, a stability analysis will be performed and submitted to the City along with the Grading Plan, as required by the City's Building Code. As such, proposed construction of the TS/MRF facility would not be permitted on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in collapse. Impacts of this component of the proposed Master Plan would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.7-5: No potential impacts related to erosion or slope stability would occur as a result of the Phase I green and wood waste or existing MRF operations. (No Impact)</p> <p>The proposed change to the green and wood waste operation would be an increase in the permitted operation to 2,500 tons per day. This increase would provide additional capacity to process green and wood waste materials that are currently processed at another facility in the Sun Valley</p>	<p>borne erosion impacts.</p> <p>Impact 4.7-4: In order to ensure adherence to the requirements of the City Building Code with respect to site preparation and grading, the following measures shall be incorporated as a Condition of Approval.</p> <p>4.7-3 All grading activities shall be performed in accordance with the provisions of Chapter IX, Division 70, of the City of Los Angeles Building Regulations Code, Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations and with the rules and regulations established by the City Department of Building and Safety.</p> <p>Impact 4.7-5: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>borne erosion would be less than significant with the implementation of the listed mitigation measures.</p> <p>Impact 4.7-4: Impacts associated with slope stability would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.7-5: No impacts would occur.</p>
--	--	--

<p>Area. The proposed change to the existing MRF operations would increase processing of recyclable materials to a maximum of 99 tpd. Green and wood waste and MRF operations do not require any earth-moving activities and therefore, would have no potential impacts related to erosion and slope stability.</p> <p>Impact 4.7-6: Landfill closure/post-closure activities could increase the potential for soil erosion to occur (Less Than Significant).</p> <p>Landfill closure activities would have the potential to exposure large areas to the potential effects of soil erosion due to earth movement activities associated with installing the four-foot soil cap over the landfill. The Final Closure Plan for the BLRC will be submitted for review and approval by the LARWQCB, the LEA, and the CIWMB for compliance with, among other things, Title 27 erosion control requirements. The permanent drainage conveyance structures will be designed to accommodate a 50-year, 96-hour storm event. In addition, drainage and erosion control measures will continue to be implemented during closure activities and post-closure maintenance as applicable to mitigate erosion and siltation potential. Use of such existing and proposed drainage and erosion control measures would ensure that any erosion impacts would be less than significant during the closure and post-closure period of the Proposed Project.</p> <p>In addition, activities associated with the movement of soil in conjunction with landfill closure and cap installation could expose soils to potential wind-borne erosion. Therefore, the potential for wind-borne erosion associated with landfill closure activities would be significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.7-7: Landfill closure and post-closure maintenance activities could result in slope instability (Less Than Significant).</p> <p>A slope stability analysis will be submitted as part of the JTD for the vertical expansion and reviewed and approved by the LARWQCB, the LEA, and the CIWMB. In addition, prior to Final Closure, a Final Closure Plan for the BLRC will be submitted for review and approval by the agencies. This review and approval process ensures that adequate engineering measures will be taken to provide an adequate safety margin for slope stability. Therefore, impacts resulting from the Phase II Closure</p>	<p>Impact 4.7-6: Mitigation measures 4.7-1 and 4.7-2 shall be implemented during landfill closure operations to reduce potentially significant wind-borne erosion impacts.</p> <p>Impact 4.7-7: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.7-6: With implementation of the listed mitigation measures, impacts with respect to wind-borne erosion would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.7-7: Impacts with respect to slope stability would be less than significant.</p>
--	--	---

<p>construction activities or post-closure maintenance component of the proposed Master Plan would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.7-8: No potential impacts related to erosion and slope stability would occur as a result of TS/MRF operations (No Impact).</p> <p>Under Phase II, the applicant proposes to operate a 4,000 tpd TS and 1,000 tpd MRF to replace current landfill operations. The TS/MRF operations do not involve any earth-moving activities and therefore, would have no potential impacts related to erosion and slope stability.</p>	<p>Impact 4.7-8: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.7-8: Impacts with respect to slope stability would be less than significant.</p>
<p>Cumulative Impacts: Development of the Proposed Project in conjunction with the related projects listed in Section 2.0 of this EIR would result in further “infilling” of various land uses in the Sun Valley Community of the City of Los Angeles. Geotechnical hazards are site-specific and there is no cumulative relationship between development of the Proposed Project and the related projects. As such, construction of the related projects is not anticipated to result in cumulatively considerable impact related to erosion and slope stability.</p>		
<p>HYDROLOGY</p>		
<p>Impact 4.8-1: The proposed vertical landfill expansion would maintain the current amount of pervious surfaces subject to runoff and would not increase the amount of impervious surface area or the volume of surface water runoff or degrade surface water quality. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>Current landfilling operations take place only on the top deck of the fill area and this is the only portion of the landfill where relatively pervious daily cover surfaces exist. The side slopes all have somewhat less pervious intermediate cover. The vertical expansion would continue this method of filling and the relative ratio of daily to intermediate cover would not change.</p> <p>The proposed transitional vertical expansion would have approximately the same drainage patterns as the existing conditions. Because the landfill footprint is not changing and there are no proposed excavation areas or changes to operational landfilling procedures, no new drainage control measures are needed. Construction and extension of existing landfill slopes upward will be accommodated by additional benching and extension of existing down drains. These will be properly designed and maintained to prevent erosion, and/or washout of cover material, thereby preventing</p>	<p>Impact 4.8-1: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.8-1: Impacts would be less than significant.</p>

<p>degradation of water quality. Since there is no proposed change in operating methods and controls, the proposed transitional expansion will not have a significant impact on surface water quality or cause regulatory standards to be violated. The proposed transitional expansion would not create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, the impact of this component of the proposed Master Plan on surface water and drainage would be less than significant</p> <p>Impact 4.8-2: The proposed vertical expansion of the landfill could impact groundwater quality if the Leachate Collection and Recovery System (LCRS) would be unable to handle increased leachate generation or if the increased weight of landfilled material would affect the landfill liner, LCRS, or landfill gas collection and control systems. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>Under the proposed transitional vertical expansion, no change in existing operations would occur. The project will continue to be designed and operated in compliance with LARWQCB's WDR Order #94-059 dated June 13, 1994 (or revised WDR issued by the LARWQCB); MRP #6434 dated November 1, 1996 (or revised MRP); Corrective Action Program dated June 1, 1994 as amended by LARWQCB letter dated July 12, 1994; and Title 27 Code of California Regulations (CCR) regulations for water quality protection related to disposal to land.</p> <p>Groundwater quality could be impacted by the proposed transitional height increase in the landfill in four possible ways: (1) if the additional waste that would be disposed at the landfill if the vertical expansion was approved would generate leachate volume that would exceed the capacity of the LCRS; (2) if the increased weight of the additional waste would undermine the integrity of the landfill liner system; (3) if the increased weight of the additional waste would undermine the integrity of the LCRS; or (4) if the increased weight of additional waste would affect the integrity or operation of the landfill gas collection and recovery system.</p> <p>Based on the HELP analysis, it was concluded that the proposed vertical expansion would not increase the leachate production rate for the facility. Since the leachate generation rate is not expected to increase due to the</p>	<p>Impact 4.8-2: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.8-2: Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
---	--	---

vertical expansion and therefore would not exceed the capacity of the existing LCRS, the project will not increase the risk of groundwater quality degradation from this source.

The results of the static and seismic stability evaluations indicate that the proposed vertical expansion of the BLRC to an elevation of 1,053 feet above MSL will meet the regulatory mandated stability criteria. Therefore, the increased weight of solid waste that would be permitted under the proposed transitional vertical expansion would not undermine the integrity of the landfill liner systems.

The LCRS is constructed of schedule 80 PVC pipe with an outside diameter of four inches. Pipe wall buckling and pipe wall crushing calculations were performed for the loading conditions that would result from the proposed transitional landfill height increase. The analysis concluded that the existing LCRS system can withstand the effect of the overburden pressure imposed by the proposed vertical expansion to an elevation of 1,053 feet above MSL. Therefore, the proposed transitional vertical expansion would not undermine the integrity of the LCRS.

SCS Engineers prepared an analysis addressing the potential for the increased weight of the additional waste under the Proposed Project. This analysis concludes that “the additional depth of refuse contemplated by the (proposed transitional vertical expansion) will not impact the ability of the gas collection and control system to prevent the migration of landfill gas”. The landfill gas management system is continuously monitored and maintained and upgraded to meet gas control needs. Continued operation of this system through the active life of the landfill and through the post-closure period will assure that groundwater quality is protected from impacts by landfill gas migration.

There are no drinking water production wells within one mile of the project site. The nearest water production well, located approximately 1,000 feet south of the landfill, is that used by Calmat for processing mined sand and gravel. In summary, because leachate production will not increase, the landfill liner and LCRS will not be compromised by the increased waste mass, the landfill gas collection system will be able to collect and control the increased landfill gas produced, and groundwater will continue to be monitored, the Proposed Project would not have a significant impact on

<p>standards to be violated, as defined in the applicable NPDES stormwater permit. The construction of the new TS/MRF would not create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. Additionally, the construction of the new TS/MRF would not contribute to flooding in the area because all stormwater is contained on-site. Therefore, impacts on surface water drainage from the construction of the TS/MRF would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.8-5: Construction of the TS/MRF could impact surface and groundwater quality. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>Three general sources of short-term construction-related storm water pollution associated with the construction of the TS/MRF are 1) the handling, storage, and disposal of construction materials containing pollutants; 2) earth moving activities which, when not controlled, may generate soil erosion and transportation via storm runoff or mechanical equipment; and 3) the maintenance and operation of construction equipment.</p> <p>The project construction site will contain a variety of construction materials that are potential sources of storm water pollution. Generally, routine safety precautions for handling and storing toxic and hazardous materials may effectively mitigate the potential pollution of storm water by these materials. These same types of common sense, “good housekeeping” procedures can be extended to non-hazardous storm water pollutants such as sawdust and other solid wastes. Poorly maintained vehicles and heavy equipment that leak fuel, oil, antifreeze or other fluids on the construction site are also common sources of storm water pollution and soil contamination. With the implementation of the identified BMPs, short-term water quality impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Since the construction of the TS/MRF each involves clearing, grading, and excavation of one or more acres, a General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit must be obtained for each project from the SWRCB prior to the start of construction. Alternatively, a consolidated permit may be obtained to cover both construction projects. The NPDES requires a Notice of Intent to be filed with the SWRCB. By filing an NOI, the developer agrees to the conditions outlined in the General Permit. The SWPPP</p>	<p>Impact 4.8-5: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.8-5: Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
--	--	---

<p>identifies which structural and nonstructural BMPs will be implemented. With the implementation of the BMPs, short-term surface water quality impacts would be less than significant. The BMPs would also work to limit the infiltrations of contaminants to groundwater as a result of construction of the proposed TS/MRF. Furthermore, groundwater quality would continue to be monitored at the project site. Therefore, impacts to water quality would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.8-6: Construction of the TS/MRF would not expose people to significant impacts related to flooding. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>The construction of the new TS/MRF would increase the amount of impervious surfaces and the amount of surface runoff area. Although the volume of runoff would increase, the capacity of the site drainage courses are sufficient to accommodate twice the volume of flows from the 50-year return frequency, 96-hour duration storm. The actual design storm peak flow exceeds that of the 50-year, 96-hour storm. The drainage from the TS/MRF construction would be directed to the adjacent on-site retention basin which is sufficient to accommodate flows from the 50-year return frequency, 96-hour duration storm. Therefore, the construction of the new TS/MRF would not result in or expose people to significant impacts related to flooding and impacts related to flooding at the project site would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.8-7: Expansion of operations at the green/wood waste facility and existing materials recovery facility could increase the amount of impervious surfaces and impact the ability of the facility to handle surface water flows or introduce new sources of surface/groundwater contamination. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>The proposed change to the green/wood waste operation would be an increase in the permitted operation to 2,500 tpd. This increase would provide additional capacity to process green and wood waste materials that are currently processed elsewhere. The proposed change to the green and wood waste processing operation would add another green waste enclosure and increase impervious surface area by approximately 60,000 square feet. Operating procedures will not change and no new sources of surface or groundwater contamination will be introduced. The proposed change to the existing MRF operation would increase processing of recyclable materials</p>	<p>Impact 4.8-6: No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>Impact 4.8-7: The following mitigation measure shall be implemented in order to ensure that increased runoff is properly directed to the existing on-site drainage facilities and that adequate capacity remains available in the existing system to handle all flows generated on site.</p> <p>4.8-1 During the design phase of the additional facilities, the applicant will recalculate drainage flows on additional impervious surfaces to ensure drainage facilities can continue to accommodate the 50-year, 96-hour storm. The applicant shall document the results of the calculations for the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering and LARWQCB.</p>	<p>Impact 4.8-6: Impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.8-7: Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
---	--	---

<p>to a maximum of 99 tpd Until the new TS/MRF is operational. The existing MRF would close at that time and its operations would be subsumed by the new TS/MRF. Additional paved or covered areas associated with the expanded operations will be approximately 40,000 square feet (less than one acre). The same dry commercial loads and recyclable materials would continue to be handled so that no new sources of surface or groundwater contamination would be introduced to the area.</p> <p>Although the volume of runoff would increase due to the combined increase in impervious areas, design of the green waste and existing MRF expansion would include provisions for handling increased runoff in conjunction with the existing drainage facilities located within the BLRC. The drainage from these areas would continue to be directed to the temporary retention pond and pumped to the on-site retention basin which is more than sufficient to accommodate flows from the 50-year return frequency, 96-hour duration storm. Therefore, impacts of these components of the proposed project related to surface water runoff would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.8-8: Landfill final closure and post-closure activities would not create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>Landfill final closure activities would be designed to meet the requirements of CCR Title 27 and would be subject to a Final Closure Plan approved by the City of Los Angeles Environmental Affairs Department Solid Waste Management Program (the LEA), Regional Water Quality Control Board and California Integrated Waste Management Board. This would include design and construction of additional permanent surface water runoff drainage facilities capable, in conjunction with existing permanent onsite drainage facilities, of accommodating runoff from the 50-year, 96-hour storm. All runoff from the facility would continue to be retained on-site in the retention basin during the closure and post-closure period. The Proposed Project would not create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage and retention systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, impacts related to surface water and drainage would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Impact 4.8-8: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.8-8: Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
--	--	---

<p>component of Phase II would not cause any significant impacts related to flooding at the project site.</p> <p>Impact 4.8-11: Operation of the new TS/MRF could create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>Runoff generated during operation of the proposed TS/MRF would be handled by the modifications to the storm drainage system that would be constructed when the TS/MRF is constructed in Phase I. No additional runoff beyond that associated with the construction of the TS/MRF would result from operation of the TS/MRF. The operation of the proposed TS/MRF would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, nor the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion of siltation on- or off-site. The operation of the proposed TS/MRF would not create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, impacts of this component of Phase II would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.8-12: Operation of the TS/MRF would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade the water quality (Less Than Significant).</p> <p>Operation of the proposed TS/MRF would be incorporated into the existing Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the landfill and will identify which structural and nonstructural BMPs will be implemented. The TS/MRF will be located in an entirely enclosed structure designed to provide odor, dust, and litter control. Items pulled from the wastestream a result of loads checks would be stored in a hazardous materials locker located inside the building with appropriate secondary containment until properly disposed. Since the operation will be enclosed and under roof, no storm water will contact materials being stored or sorted inside. On occasion, baled recyclables awaiting shipment to market may have to be temporarily stored outside. However, the BMPs are designed to minimize storm water contact. Storm water running off the building and surrounding paved area of the TS/MRF will be directed to the on-site retention basin. Operation inside the building combined with BMPs for the facility will</p>	<p>Impact 4.8-11: No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>Impact 4.8-12: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.8-11: Impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.8-12: Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
--	---	---

<p>result in less than significant impacts to surface water quality. Because the TS/MRF does not involve deposition of waste below ground, no impacts to groundwater quality will occur.</p> <p>The TS/MRF portion of the Proposed Project would not have significant impact on groundwater or surface water quality and would not create pollution, contamination, or nuisance as defined in Section 13050 of the California Water Code (CWC) or that cause regulatory standards to be violated, as defined in the applicable NPDES stormwater permit. The Proposed Project would not expand the area affected by contaminants; result in an increased level of groundwater contamination; or cause regulatory water quality standards at an existing production well to be violated. The Proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade the water quality. Therefore, impacts to water quality would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.8-13: Operation of the TS/MRF would not expose people or property to flooding impacts (Less Than Significant).</p> <p>During the design of the proposed TS/MRF, drainage facility modifications would be included to accommodate runoff from the 50-year, 96-hour storm. The operation of the TS/MRF would also not cause flooding during the project 50-year developed storm event. Impacts related to flooding would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Impact 4.8-13: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.8-13: Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
<p>Cumulative Impact: Implementation of the Proposed Project along with the related projects listed in Section 2.0 would not have a potential impact on storm drainage and surface water quality. In part because of the existing storm water runoff problems the Sun Valley area faces during storm events, all of the facility’s run-off is retained on-site and there will be no increase in run-off from the site under the Proposed Project. In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines (CCR, Title 14, Chapter 3) Section 15130)(a)(1), an EIR need not discuss potential cumulative impacts which do not result in part from the project evaluated in the EIR. Because the Proposed Project will not have an incremental contribution to the local storm drainage system, it would not contribute to a cumulative considerable effect in the event that any off-site areas served by local storm drains were to increase peak flows to the system.</p>		
<p>HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</p>		
<p>Impact 4.9-1: The proposed transitional vertical expansion would not change hazardous materials/waste handling procedures. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>Phase I of the proposed Master Plan would not alter or in any way affect the</p>	<p>Impact 4.9-1: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.9-1: Impacts associated with hazards materials/waste handling procedures would be less than significant.</p>

<p>types of waste currently accepted for disposal at the Bradley Landfill. The Hazardous Waste Load Check Program, Special Waste Program, and Radioactive Waste Exclusion Program would continue to be implemented under the Proposed Project as a means of detecting and isolating potentially hazardous wastes. These programs would continue to ensure that potentially hazardous materials do not enter the landfill. Therefore, the potential for the proposed continuation of landfill operations, in conjunction with the transitional vertical expansion to result in hazardous impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.9-2: The proposed transitional vertical expansion would increase landfill gas generation. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>The proposed transitional vertical expansion will result in an additional 4.7 million cubic yards of disposal capacity which would have the potential to generate additional LFG. As discussed in the Air Quality Section of this EIR, projected LFG recovery rates are expected to rise slightly under the proposed transitional vertical expansion and peak in 2007. The analysis also demonstrates that the peak recovery rate would be within the capacity of the existing LFG collection and control system, not including additional capacity provided by the five on-site electricity generator sets. Therefore, the existing LFG collection and control system will continue to provide adequate capacity to control migration of LFG and prevent any explosion hazard.</p> <p>In order to accommodate the proposed transitional vertical expansion, the vertical LFG extraction wells will be extended and the header piping and laterals will be raised up accordingly as the fill is placed and in compliance with Title 27. To ensure the system is effective in controlling migration, the perimeter gas monitoring wells will continue to be monitored on a monthly basis and the wells will be field adjusted as needed. In addition, on-site and off-site continuous in-structure monitoring will continue as needed as an additional element of protection. With the continue operation of the current monitoring and control system mandated by current regulations, there will be no hazard impact from LFG migration due to the project.</p> <p>Impact 4.9-3: Construction of the new TS/MRF would not involve the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials/waste. (Less Than Significant)</p>	<p>Impact 4.9-2: No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>Impact 4.9-3: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.9-2: Impacts associated with increased LFG generation would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.9-3: Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
--	---	--

<p>Construction of the proposed TS/MRF adjacent to the existing landfill would include the importation of dirt for the foundation, associated grading activities, installation of paving and curbing, and erection of the pre-engineered metal building. No demolition would be required as part of this phase. Construction activities would not involve the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, the potential for the proposed construction of the TS/MRF to result in hazardous impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.9-4: The increase in existing green and wood waste and MRF operations on Bradley East could increase the potential for hazardous materials to be sent to the site, however, the project applicant will continue utilizing existing procedures to eliminate hazardous materials. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>The proposed change to the green/wood waste operation would be an increase in the permitted operation to 2,500 tpd. This increase would provide additional capacity to process green and wood waste materials that are currently processed elsewhere. Odor and dust control measures would continue to be implemented. The increase in permitted intake at Bradley East’s green/wood waste operation would not alter or in any way affect the types of waste currently accepted at the operation. As only green and wood wastes are accepted, no hazardous materials would enter Bradley East. Therefore, the potential for the proposed increase in permitted intake at Bradley East’s green/wood waste operation to result in hazardous impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>The proposed change to the MRF operation would increase processing of recyclable materials to a maximum of 99 tpd from the existing maximum level of 92 tpd. The increase in permitted levels of recyclables processing would not alter or in any way affect the types of waste currently accepted at the operation such that hazardous and potentially hazardous materials are prohibited at the site. The programs currently utilized for the detection of potentially hazardous waste would continue to ensure that hazardous materials do not enter the landfill. Therefore, the potential for the proposed increase in permitted intake at the MRF to result in hazardous impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Impact 4.9-4: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.9-4: Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
---	--	---

<p>Impact 4.9-5: Landfill closure activities would eliminate MSW from entering the project site for disposal. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>When the existing landfill reaches its maximum capacity or the permits expire on April 14, 2007 (whichever comes sooner), the landfill would be closed and no additional MSW would be accepted for burial. Landfill closure activities would include the impact of dirt and inert waste to provide a four foot soil cap and installation of landscaping features. Therefore, no impacts related to hazardous materials in the landfill would occur.</p> <p>Impact 4.9-6: Existing procedures would continue to be utilized at the proposed TS/MRF to ensure that hazardous materials are not accepted for processing. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>If the Proposed Project is approved and the landfill approaches a final height of 1,053 ft msl, landfill operations will transition into a TS/MRF operation. MSW would be received, consolidated and transported to other regional landfills. The procedures currently in place at Bradley Landfill for detecting, removing, and processing unexpected hazardous materials would continue to be utilized at the transfer station. Commercial/residential recyclable materials would be received, sorted, and consolidated at the MRF. From the MRF, these materials would be transported to other regional recycled materials processing facilities. All materials would be adequately screened for potential hazards and handled in accordance with existing procedures. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Impact 4.9-5: No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>Impact 4.9-6: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.9-5: Impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.9-6: Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
<p>Cumulative Impacts: The project site is permitted to only receive and dispose of non-hazardous wastes. In addition, Bradley Landfill conducts programs through which the accidental disposal of potentially hazardous and other prohibited wastes are detected and removed from the waste stream. Development of the Proposed Project would continue to operate under existing conditions and permits for hazardous and non-hazardous wastes. Should any of the related project sites require remediation or contain potentially hazardous materials, it is anticipated that they would be developed in accordance with all applicable environmental laws and regulations. Mitigation or remedial action measures, if necessary, would be implemented on a case-by-case basis, as necessary under the provisions of applicable laws and regulations. Development of the Proposed Project, in conjunction with any of the identified related projects, would therefore not result in cumulatively considerable effects with respect to hazards and hazardous materials.</p>		
<p>UTILITIES</p>		
<p>Impact 4.10-1: The proposed transitional vertical expansion would increase the amount of MSW accepted and could potentially increase the amount of leachate and gas condensate requiring disposal. (Less Than Significant)</p>	<p>Impact 4.10-1: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.10-1: Impacts would be less than significant.</p>

<p>As result of Phase I the amount of leachate in the landfill that is related to precipitation would not change as compared to existing conditions. Phase I would increase the amount of trash that is disposed of in the landfill and therefore could increase the amount of leachate and LFG generated. Leachate would continue to be processed by the existing LCRS in accordance with the provisions of the WDRs (revised to accommodate the Proposed Project), The LCRS would therefore have the capacity to accommodate the additional leachate that would be produced. In addition, since leachate generation under the proposed transitional vertical expansion would not exceed existing conditions, the amount of leachate discharged in the sewer system would remain the same and would therefore be accommodated by the sewer system already serving the project site. According to the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, there are no existing or known sewer service problems/deficiencies in the project area. Therefore, impacts relating to leachate under the Proposed Project would be less than significant.</p> <p>Phase I could also increase the amount of gas that would be produced by the biodegradation of the MSW. Therefore, more gas would be processed each day by the gas plant, and more gas condensate would be created. The aqueous phase of the gas condensate is treated as wastewater and is either injected into the flares for combustion or discharged into the City’s sanitary sewer system. The hydrocarbon phase is trucked off-site and handled in accordance with hazardous waste regulations. Phase I would therefore have potential wastewater impacts related to the generation of landfill gas. The additional wastewater would be processed by the gas condensate collection system and the landfill gas collection system would have the capacity to accommodate the additional landfill gas that would be produced. The Industrial Waste Water permit for BLRC permits discharge of up to 20,000 gallons per day to the sewer system. Increased processing of gas would not produce gas condensate that would exceed this permitted amount. In addition, the sewer system serving the project site has sufficient capacity to accommodate the wastewater generated by the project. Therefore, impacts with respect to increased wastewater attributable to gas condensate would be less than significant.</p> <p>Impact 4.10-2: No wastewater would be generated from the construction of the TS/MRF or the green/wood waste operations that would require disposal. (Less Than Significant)</p>	<p>Impact 4.10-2: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.10-2: Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
--	---	--

<p>Construction of the proposed TS/MRF would include the importation of dirt for the foundation, associated grading, installation of paving and curbing, and erection of the pre-engineered metal building. No demolition would be required as part of this phase. Construction activities would not generate wastewater that would be discharged into the public sanitary sewer system. As such, construction related wastewater impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>The proposed change to the green/wood waste operation would be an increase in the permitted operation to 2,500 tpd. Material from the green/wood waste operation is processed within 48 hours and is transported to the consumer within seven days of delivery. Increasing the amount of green/wood waste processed at this facility would not result in the generation of any additional wastewater, since wastewater is not produced from these activities under existing conditions. In addition, rain water falling on green/wood waste at the project site is absorbed by the waste material and generally does not result in free-flowing contact water that needs to be treated as leachate. In the rare event that free-flowing contact water is generated in the greewaste area, it is covered with soil or otherwise contained with temporary earthen berms or sandbags to keep the water within the lined area and prevent contact with the public. Likewise, recyclable materials are not stored in the landfill, but are shipped off-site. Therefore, the proposed changes to existing MRF operations would not have wastewater impacts.</p> <p>Impact 4.10-3: Phase I of the proposed project would marginally increase the amount of non-industrial wastewater generated on the project site (Less Than Significant).</p> <p>Phase I would also increase the number of daily employees at the project site by 28 employees (9 employees at Bradley West/West Extension, and 19 employees at Bradley East). The 28 additional employees could cause a marginal increase in the amount of non-industrial wastewater generated at the project site, which would not be expected to exceed the capacity of existing on-site wastewater facilities. Wastewater impacts in this respect would also be less than significant.</p>	<p>Impact 4.10-3: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.10-3: Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
---	---	--

<p>Impact 4.10-6: The increase of employees during Phase II of the Master Plan would generate a marginal increase in non-industrial wastewater. (Less Than Significant)</p> <p>Upon completion of Phase II, 87 additional employees would occupy the BLRC on a daily basis. However, a certain times during the landfill closure process, up to 117 additional employees may occupy the BLRC. The 117 additional employees could cause a marginal increase in the amount of non-industrial wastewater generated at the project site, which would not be expected to exceed the capacity of existing on-site wastewater facilities. Wastewater impacts in this respect would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Impact 4.10-6: No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impact 4.10-6: Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
<p>Cumulative Impacts: Industrial Waste Discharge permits, which allow for the discharge of wastewater to the City’s sanitary sewer system, are issued on a case-by-case basis during which a project’s expected wastewater generation is compared to the sewer system’s available capacity. The sewer lines serving the project site presently have excess capacity over peak flows that can handle expected flows from the Proposed Project and related projects that utilize the same lines. As such, implementation of the Proposed Project would not combine with any other sources of industrial wastewater discharge to exceed the capacity of the City of Los Angeles sanitary sewer system, and cumulative impacts would thus be less than significant.</p>		