

---

---

## 5.0 GENERAL IMPACT CATEGORIES

---

---

### 5.1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Title 14, Article 9, Section 15126.2(b) of the Guidelines to the California Environmental Quality Act requires that an EIR describe any significant environmental impacts that cannot be avoided. That section is restated as follows:

*“Describe any significant impacts, including those which can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of insignificance. Where there are impacts that cannot be alleviated without imposing an alternative design, their implications and the reason why the project is being proposed, notwithstanding their effect should be described.”*

Based on the analyses contained in this EIR, the Proposed Project would result in significant unavoidable environmental impacts during Phase I relative to:

- Aesthetics (view blockage);
- Regional NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions during Phase I construction;
- Regional VOC, NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions during Phase I operations (and when construction and operations overlap).

During Phase II, significant unavoidable impacts would occur relative to:

- Regional NO<sub>x</sub> emissions during Phase II construction and operations (regional NO<sub>x</sub> emissions would be reduced during Phase II operations);
- Regional VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions when Phase II operation and construction activities overlap; and
- Noise impacts during landfill closure activities.

### 5.2 GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Title 14, Article 9, Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of the ways in which a Proposed Project could be growth inducing. This includes ways in which the project would foster economic or population growth, of the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Title 14, Article 9, Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines reads as follows:

*“Discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a wastewater treatment plant might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas.) Increases in population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Also discuss the characteristic of some projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.”*

The Proposed Project could foster economic growth by adding new employees. A maximum increase of 115 full-time permanent new employment opportunities would be created with the completion of the Proposed Project, mostly with the new TS/MRF. Table 3-13, in Section 3.0, Project Description, provides a description as to the source of these employees. These employees are anticipated to be drawn from the surrounding area and are not anticipated to increase the demand for housing or local services. Therefore, no significant population, housing, or employment impacts would be created by the Proposed Project.

The project site is located within a highly developed urban setting. Infrastructure exists on and around the project site which would adequately meet the needs of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would meet the already existing needs of the surrounding communities with respect to solid waste disposal and would not induce growth in an area that is not already developed to accommodate such growth. No new landfills would be created as a result of the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant growth inducing impacts.

### **5.3 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES**

Title 14, Article 9, Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines states that significant irreversible environmental changes associated with a Proposed Project shall be discussed, including the following:

- Uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project which would be irreversible because a large commitment of such resources makes removal or non-use thereafter unlikely;
- Primary impacts and particularly, secondary impacts which commit future generations to similar uses; and
- Irreversible damage which may result from environmental accidents associated with the project.
- Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

The Proposed Project would consume limited, slowly renewable, and non-renewable resources. During Phase I of the Proposed Project the following types of resources would be consumed: aggregate materials used in concrete and asphalt including sand, gravel, and stone, metals such as steel; petrochemical construction materials such as plastics; and water. Fossil fuels such as gasoline and oil would also be consumed in the use of construction vehicles and equipment and operation of trash and transfer trucks. However, this consumption would not be excessive or out of line with other industrial activities in the City of Los Angeles or Southern California. Neither the transitional vertical expansion, expanded green and wood waste operation or construction of the new TS/MRF represents a large commitment of such resources.

Subsequent use and maintenance of the project site (Phase II) would also require the use of nonrenewable resources such as electricity, water, and petroleum based fuel. The Proposed Project would add traffic to local roads. However, the operation of the new TS/MRF does not involve consumption or resources beyond those normally associated with industrial activities nor would it represent a large commitment of such resources. Moreover, the proposed new MRF facility would facilitate reuse and recycling of materials, such as aluminum and metals, that would otherwise need to be produced from nonrenewable resources.

Potential irreversible damage from environmental accidents associated with the project are unlikely and would be avoided by compliance with existing conditions on the landfill, mitigation measures proposed in the EIR, and existing City, County, State, and federal safety regulations.

The Proposed Project would not commit the site to permanent use as a TS/MRF and green and wood waste processing facility. Future use of the landfilled portion of the site would be restricted in use because construction of buildings is not permitted over landfilled areas. However, this commitment was made at the time the site was first used as a landfill nearly 50 years ago and does not result from the Proposed Project.

#### **5.4 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE**

Environmental Justice (EJ) is the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Fair treatment means that no group of people, including a racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic group, should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial operations or the execution of federal, state, local, and tribal programs and policies. Meaningful involvement means that: (1) potentially affected community residents have an appropriate opportunity to participate in decisions about a proposed activity that will affect their environment and/or health; (2) the public's contribution can influence the regulatory agency's decision; (3) the concerns of all participants involved will be considered

in the decision making process; and (4) the decision makers seek out and facilitate the involvement of those potentially affected.<sup>1</sup>

Environmental justice is not an impact on the physical environment as that term is defined under CEQA:

“Environment” means the physical conditions which exist within the area which will be affected by a Proposed Project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance....The “environment” includes both natural and man-made conditions (CEQA Guidelines, Title 14, Article 20, Section 15360).

Although an analysis of environmental justice is not required under CEQA as part of an EIR process, the following information is provided in order to provide the decision-makers and lead and responsible agencies with information concerning the environmental justice implications of the Proposed BLRC Transition Master Plan project.

### **Federal Regulations**

On February 11, 1994, President Clinton signed Executive Order 12898 (E.O. 12898), entitled “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low Income Populations”. This EO directs each Federal agency “to make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low income populations in the United States....”

Under the EO, the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) was designated to coordinate the development of guidance criteria to Federal agencies on criteria for identifying disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations or low income populations. USEPA identified a general framework for determining whether a disparate impact exists to be followed by all Federal agencies, consisting of five basic steps.

- Identifying the affected population;
- Determining the demographics of the affected populations;
- Determining the total universe of facilities and total affected populations;
- Conducting a disparate impact analysis; and
- Determining the significance of the disparity.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www/ef/gpv/compliance/environmentaljustice/index.html>, July 30, 2004.

**State Regulations**

California Government Code Section 65040.12 defines environmental justice as the “fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adopted, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.” It also states that the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) is the agency responsible for coordinating environmental justice concerns. California Government Code Section 65040.2 requires OPR to develop environmental justice guidance for General Plans.

California Public Resources Code §71110 et seq. established California’s EJ Program. This section requires the following:

“The California Environmental Protection Agency, in designing its missions for programs, policies, and standards, shall do all of the following:

- a. Conduct its programs, policies, and activities that substantially affect human health or the environment in a manner that ensure the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and income levels, including minority populations and low-income populations of the state.
- b. Promote enforcement of all health and environmental statutes within its jurisdiction in a manner that ensures the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and income levels, including minority populations and low-income populations in the state.
- c. Ensure greater public participation in the agency’s development, adoption, and implementation of environmental regulations and policies.
- d. Improve research and data collection for programs within the agency relating to the health of, and environment of, people of all races, cultures, and income levels, including minority populations and low-income populations of the state.
- e. Coordinate its efforts and share information with the United States Environmental Protection Agency.
- f. Identify differential patterns of consumption of natural resources among people of different socioeconomic classifications for programs within the agency.
- g. Consult with and review any information received from the Working Group on Environmental Justice established to assist the California Environmental Protection

Agency in development an agencywide strategy pursuant to Section 71113 that meets the requirements of this section.”<sup>2</sup>

As mandated by §71110 et seq. of the Public Resources Code, the OPR was to formulate guidance on the preparation of EJ analyses. In October 2003, the Office of Planning and Research issued a report entitled “Environmental Justice in California State Government”. This report was “intended to provide a brief history of Environmental Justice (EJ), report on the status of OPR’s efforts, and provide an outline of EJ findings, goals and policies for future EJ efforts within state government”.<sup>3</sup> The report also contains information regarding the status of the EJ policies of some state agencies, including the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA). The California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) is one of six Boards, Departments and Offices (BDOs) within CalEPA. CIWMB has primary regulatory oversight authority for landfills and other solid waste processing facilities.

CalEPA has established a model EJ program that involves an Interagency Working Group (IWG) on Environmental Justice, a multi-stakeholder Advisory Committee made up of 17 members to guide program and policy development and to develop an EJ Strategy for the Agency. In October, 2003, the Advisory Committee presented its report advising the IWG on the issues goals and actions for development of the EJ strategy. At its October 14, 2003 public meeting, the IWG approved a resolution endorsing the Advisory Committee’s report and committing to using the goals and recommendations contained in it to provide the structure for development of the intra-agency EJ strategy.

Guided by the IWG’s resolution CalEPA staff prepared draft IWG recommendations to the Secretary of CalEPA on an intra-agency EJ strategy. Released for public comment in April 2004, the draft recommendations facilitated a deliberative approach to address environmental justice issues while recognizing the constraints of CalEPA’s legal authority and available resources. On May 24, 2004, the IWG met to discuss the draft IWG recommendations and received written and hear oral public comments on the draft recommendations. This information was incorporated into a CalEPA Draft EJ Strategy document that was distributed for a 30-day comment period in July, 2004. This document is in the process of being finalized with the assistance of comments received during this review period.

The CalEPA Draft EJ Strategy includes mission and vision statements, identifies core values and establishes four goals for achieving CalEPA’s environmental justice mission:

- Ensure meaningful public participation and promote community capacity building to allow communities and Tribes to effectively participate in environmental decision making processes.

---

<sup>2</sup> [www.calepa.ca.gov/EnvJustice/Documents/2003/Appendices/AppendixE.pdf](http://www.calepa.ca.gov/EnvJustice/Documents/2003/Appendices/AppendixE.pdf), July 30, 2004.

<sup>3</sup> *Office of Government Gray Davis, Planning and Research, Environmental Justice in California State Government, October 2003.*

- Integrate environmental justice into the development, adoption, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies.
- Improve research and data collection to promote and address environmental justice related to the health and environment of communities of color and low-income populations.
- Ensure effective cross-media coordination and accountability in addressing environmental justice issues.

Specific objectives are also identified for each of these broad-based goals.

As part of the strategic planning process, CalEPA's BDOs are developing specific EJ strategies and work plans to reflect their respective programmatic responsibilities and priorities. Recognizing that it may take some time to complete this process, the Secretary of CalEPA has directed staff to implement an interim action plan to:

- Develop guidance on precautionary approaches;
- Develop guidance on cumulative impacts analysis;
- Improve tools for public participation and community capacity-building; and
- Ensure EJ considerations within the Governor's Environmental Action Plan.

The Draft CalEPA EJ Action Plan (August, 2004) includes steps to implement the Secretary's direction. The Draft EJ Action Plan was released for a 30-day public review on August 13, 2004, and comments were taken through September 13, 2004.

The first two items in the Draft EJ Action Plan listed above are directly pertinent to the Proposed Project. CIWMB staff will lead the intra-agency Precautionary Approaches Workgroup to accomplish, with appropriate stakeholder input, the following by Summer 2005:

- Identify where/how precautionary approaches are used, or could be used, in CalEPA's environmental programs; evaluate whether additional precaution is needed to address or prevent environmental justice problems; and identify obstacles to precautionary actions.
- Identify reasonable, cost-effective approaches that could be used to prevent or eliminate adverse environmental impacts.
- Develop guidance on precautionary approaches and recommend implementation options, including proposals for policy, regulatory and statutory changes.

CalEPA's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) staff will lead the intra-agency Multi-media Cumulative Impacts Workgroup to accomplish, with appropriate stakeholder input, the following by Summer, 2005:

- Develop a common, objective definition for multi-media cumulative impacts.
- Inventory current cumulative impacts studies, protocols and tools and identify needs to be addressed.
- Develop criteria and protocols for identifying and addressing environmental justice gaps in standard risk assessment.
- Develop guidance on multi-media cumulative impacts analysis, prevention and reduction; and recommend implementation options, including proposals for policy, regulatory and statutory changes.

### **Local Regulations**

On November 19, 2003 a motion was introduced to the Los Angeles City Council which would designate a portion of the Sun Valley area as an Environmental Justice Improvement Area. This area was proposed to cover an area within Sun Valley bounded by Glenoaks Boulevard to Sunland Boulevard/Vineland Avenue to Strathern Street to Lankershim Boulevard to Haddon Avenue to Montague Avenue to Glenoaks Boulevard. Specifically, this motion stated the following:

- Designate the geographic area within the Sun Valley bounded by Glenoaks Boulevard to Sunland Boulevard/Vineland Avenue to Strathern Street to Lankershim Boulevard to Haddon Avenue to Montague Avenue to Glenoaks Boulevard as the Sun Valley Environmental Justice Area.
- Request the City Attorney to report in 60 days on the status of the multi-agency Sun Valley Environmental Task Force, including a description of inspections to date and pending enforcement actions.
- Direct the Planning Department to refer to the Environmental Affairs Department (EAD), for review and comment, all pending and future land use applications relating to active or closed landfills, solid waste, auto-dismantling or recycling facilities within said Area. Instruct the EAD to report in 60 days on resources and funding that will be needed to perform said reviews.
- Instruct the Planning Department to refer to the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD), for review and comment, all pending and future land use applications for facilities proposing to use non-exempt quantities of listed hazardous materials within said Area. Direct the LAFD to report in 60 days on resources and funding that will be needed to perform said reviews.



- Direct the Planning Department to post at the Sun Valley Public Library a copy of pending and future discretionary land use applications for industrial facilities within said Area, along with applicable dates for public hearings and time lines for receipt of written public comments.
- Instruct the Planning Department to complete a written study, including conducting three local public hearings in Sun Valley by May 31, 2004, that proposes design guidelines and standards for the establishment, expansion, continuation and reuse of industrial facilities within said Area. The Planning Department is to consult with local Neighborhood and Community Advisory Councils, residents, businesses, the Chamber of Commerce, and City departments.
- Direct the Planning Department to report to the Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee within 90 days regarding its efforts to improve coordination of comprehensive planning efforts within said Area and to report within 60 days on funding requirements.
- Instruct the Department of Recreation and Parks to report to the PLUM Committee within 90 days on the existing inventory of parks and recreation centers within the Sun Valley.

This motion was referred to the Environmental Quality and Waste Management Committee and the Planning and Land Use Management Committee for their review and recommendations.

On April 13, 2005, the Environmental Quality and Waste Management Committee approved the recommendations contained in the Motion (see Appendix J-3) and made two additional recommendations. On June 15, 2005, the Planning and Land Use Management Committee reviewed the Motion and the recommendations. At this meeting the matter was continued until July 6, 2005. At this meeting it was briefed that the Environmental Justice Area accounts for about 1,500 acres and that the boundaries have been modified to add areas to the west and northwest to include portions of Council District 7, to the immediate west in Council District 6, and to the extreme southeast which includes portions of Council District 2. The Planning and Land Use Management Committee concurred with the recommendations of the Environmental Quality and Waste Management Committee and requested that Council also do the following:

- Refer the request in the Motion to the City Planning Department as lead, City Attorney, Environmental Affairs Department (EAD), Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD), Community Development Department (CDD), and the Department of Recreation and Parks, along with the assistance of the Sun Valley Environmental Taskforce, and request a status update within 60 days.
- Request the LAFD, EAD, City Planning Department (and any other fiscally impacted City Department) to report on the resources and funding that it will need to comply with the intent of the Motion.

At the Los Angeles City Council Meeting on July 20, 2005, the City Council adopted the reports of the two committees. As of this time, the motion to form the Sun Valley Environmental Justice Area has not been approved.

The Proposed Project is not subject to the requirements of Executive Order 12898 because no federal agency action is required. However, the environmental justice analysis contained in this EIR has been provided to reflect the current state of policy and procedural development to address EJ at the State level and to address the issues related to environmental justice that were raised during the public informational meeting of December 2002 and the public scoping meeting of April 2003, and in the responses to the Notice of Preparation on this EIR.

### **Methodology**

Because, as noted above, the development of policies and procedures to address environmental justice issues in the State are still in process and not due to be completed until the summer of 2005, the EJ analysis presented in this EIR is based primarily on the methodology established by USEPA in response to the requirements of EO 12898. Under this methodology, determination of environmental justice is a multi-step process. The first step is the determination of whether a potentially significant adverse environmental impact would be created as a result of the Proposed Project. If the potential for a significant impact exists, then a determination of the socio-economic makeup of the community experiencing the impact is required. If the impact is likely to fall upon a minority or low-income community, the determination is made as to whether the potential impacts rises to a level in excess of generally accepted standards or appreciably exceeds the impact upon the general population, both individually and when viewed cumulatively with multiple exposures.

The methodology used in this section identifies areas in which potentially significant adverse impacts, such as traffic, air quality, noise, and aesthetic impacts could occur. The area of impact was determined based upon the area of notification requested by the public at the informational meeting held on December 12, 2002. The area of impact covered extends out for approximately three miles from the landfill. All census tracts within this three mile radius were mapped and the determination was made as to whether any given tract constituted a minority or low-income population. Census tract information was based on the 2000 Census, the most recent federal demographic data for the affected area. Copies of this data can be found in Appendix J-1 or at [http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?\\_lang=en](http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en).

The U.S. EPA guidance identifies the following as minority classifications: American Indian (including Eskimo and Aleut), Asian, Hispanic, Black/African American, Pacific Islander, and other non-white. According to the EPA guidance, a minority population exists if the minority population of the affected area exceeds 50 percent or is meaningfully greater than the minority population percentage in the general population, or community of comparison.

The EPA Guidelines recommend that income level be determined by the application of either the Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines or the statutory definition for very low income used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development for housing benefit purposes. The

EPA Guidelines do not, however, provide guidance as to the percentage of low-income residents necessary or appropriate to classify an area as “low-income”. For purposes of this analysis, low income is based on 2000 Census data, which defines the poverty level as 80% or less of the County median income<sup>4</sup>. At the census tract level, a community is determined to be low-income if the population below poverty level is greater than the County of Los Angeles average of 15%.

There are a total of 61 census tracts within three (3) miles of the Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center. The census tract numbers are listed in Table 5-1 and shown on Figure 5-1.

The first step in determining whether the Proposed Project would generate any environmental justice implications, was the determination of whether the population of a specific census tract was considered minority or low-income. A census tract was determined to represent a minority population if the total minority population comprised 50% or more of the total population within the census tract. As can be seen from Table 5-2, 54 of the 61 census tracts had a minority population greater than 50%. The only census tracts in the impacted area that do not contain a minority population greater than 50% are: 1021.01, 1021.02, 1033.00, 1034.00, 1041.07, 3104.00, and 9302.00.

Low income is defined as being 80% or less of the County median income. The median income for individuals in Los Angeles County is \$22,403 per year.<sup>5</sup> Eighty percent of the median income would be \$17,922.40 per year. The U.S. Census collects income data in ranges (e.g., \$2,500 to \$4,999, \$45,000 to 49,999). The poverty level for Los Angeles County (\$17,922.40) falls in the \$17,500 to \$19,999 range. For the purposes of this analysis, it was assumed that an annual income of \$19,999 or less per person was equal to the poverty level. As can be seen in Table 5-2, all of the census tracts within the impact area, with the exception of two (1033.00 and 9302.00), are considered to be low-income.

---

<sup>4</sup> [www.nahro.org/reference/faqs/cfm](http://www.nahro.org/reference/faqs/cfm), August 12, 2004.

<sup>5</sup> Table P85: Median Earnings in 1999 (Dollars) by Sex for the Population 16 Years and Over with Earnings, <http://factfinder.census.gov>.

**Table 5-1  
Census Tracts within Three Miles of Bradley Landfill**

• 102101	• 121100
• 102102	• 121210
• 103300	• 121220
• 103400	• 121600
• 104103	• 121800
• 104104	• 121900
• 104105	• 122000
• 104106	• 122110
• 104107	• 122120
• 104202	• 122200
• 104320	• 122410
• 104401	• 122420
• 104402	• 123010
• 104500	• 123020
• 104610	• 123103
• 104620	• 123203
• 104710	• 123204
• 104702	• 123205
• 104810	• 123206
• 104820	• 123301
• 119000	• 123303
• 119100	• 123304
• 119200	• 123410
• 119400	• 123420
• 119700	• 123900
• 119800	• 124101
• 119900	• 127101
• 120300	• 310400
• 120400	• 310500
• 121010	• 930200
• 121020	

**Figure 5-1, Census Tracts within 3 Miles of Bradley Landfill**

**Table 5-2  
Local Impact Study Area**

Census Tract	Population	Percentages									Persons Below Poverty Level
		White	Hispanic	Black/African American	Asian	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Other Non-White	Two or More Races	Total Minority	
1021.01	3,387	62.6	27.0	2.0	5.4	0.5	0.1	0.4	2.2	37.6	16.2
1021.02	6,739	53.9	30.2	2.0	10.0	0.4	0.1	0.2	3.4	46.3	19.2
1033.00	3,739	78.6	13.7	1.0	3.0	0.4	0.1	0.5	2.8	21.5	14.0
1034.00	6,209	67.0	21.5	1.5	6.1	0.7	0.1	0.1	3.1	33.1	21.4
1041.03	3,840	9.6	62.5	20.3	5.4	0.3	0.1	0.03	1.9	90.5	22.3
1041.04	3,507	25.2	45.0	20.3	6.1	0.6	0.2	0.2	2.5	74.9	22.3
1041.05	5,233	6.8	74.8	11.7	5.6	0.3	0.02	0.2	0.7	93.3	27.3
1041.06	4,886	7.4	67.7	20.5	2.9	0.3	0.1	0.1	1.1	92.7	24.2
1041.07	552	67.6	20.5	8.7	2.4	0.2	0	0	0.7	32.5	20.8
1042.02	7,809	7.8	73.9	14.2	3.0	0.1	0.04	0.1	1.0	92.3	25.5
1043.20	5,695	1.5	86.8	9.8	1.1	0.2	0.02	0	0.7	98.6	29.1
1044.01	4,584	1.9	96.5	0.6	0.7	0.2	0	0.03	0.2	98.2	25.9
1044.02	5,012	4.6	94.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	0	0	0.3	95.4	28.1
1045.00	4,847	4.0	93.8	0.8	0.9	0.3	0.1	0	0.1	96.0	25.4
1046.10	3,600	2.1	96.0	0.2	1.1	0.3	0	0	0.4	98.0	31.8
1046.20	3,417	2.7	96.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0	0.06	0.2	97.4	24.9
1047.01	4,168	1.2	95.1	3.1	0.2	0.1	0.03	0	0.2	98.7	27.0
1047.02	6,262	8.2	73.7	14.7	1.4	0.6	0.04	0.2	1.2	91.8	26.2
1048.10	5,101	5.9	90.4	0.9	1.9	0.08	0.1	0.04	0.8	94.2	23.4
1048.20	5,389	5.7	87.5	1.0	4.7	0.3	0.04	0.3	0.7	94.5	29.0
1190.00	6,036	14.0	73.4	1.1	9.7	0.3	0.04	0	1.5	86.0	24.2
1191.00	4,911	5.1	88.4	1.5	4.1	0.4	0.3	0	0.3	95.0	30.0
1192.00	4,039	9.0	80.4	2.5	7.0	0.3	0.03	0.2	0.7	91.1	27.9
1194.00	6,726	14.8	73.0	2.1	8.2	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.9	85.2	22.0
1197.00	4,666	21.3	45.4	2.0	28.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	2.5	78.9	20.4
1198.00	5,714	14.9	67.8	1.7	13.3	0.3	0.02	0.04	2.1	85.3	23.1
1199.00	6,065	18.8	53.8	1.9	23.2	0.2	0.05	0.3	1.8	81.1	19.8
1203.00	4,982	22.1	53.6	2.1	18.6	0.2	0.1	0.3	3.1	78.0	20.4

Census Tract	Population	Percentages									Persons Below Poverty Level
		White	Hispanic	Black/African American	Asian	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Other Non-White	Two or More Races	Total Minority	
1204.00	5,575	25.5	48.0	6.1	16.3	0.2	0.1	0.2	3.6	74.5	23.2
1210.10	4,535	26.8	55.0	1.7	10.7	0.3	0.8	0.1	4.7	73.3	22.9
1210.20	3,795	24.9	60.3	1.7	9.2	0.5	0.2	0.1	3.0	75.0	26.1
1211.00	4,315	29.5	59.6	1.3	7.0	0.1	0.1	0.5	1.9	70.5	22.9
1212.10	4,853	11.2	77.4	2.2	7.4	0.4	0.02	0.1	1.3	88.8	25.0
1212.20	4,110	12.3	78.9	0.7	6.2	0.1	0.4	0.2	1.2	87.7	26.4
1216.00	2,841	36.1	31.9	2.2	25.5	0	0.1	0.2	4.2	64.1	18.5
1218.00	7,451	14.7	72.7	3.9	6.2	0.3	0.03	0.2	2.1	85.4	27.9
1219.00	4,262	14.7	74.9	0.9	7.1	0.3	0.1	0.1	2.1	85.5	21.8
1220.00	5,077	34.7	35.1	1.7	19.9	0.1	0.1	0.3	8.3	65.5	26.3
1221.10	5,421	11.0	79.5	1.6	6.4	0.1	0.1	0.2	1.2	89.1	28.6
1221.20	4,761	9.2	82.7	1.3	4.8	0.1	0.2	0.1	1.9	91.1	23.0
1222.00	5,607	15.9	76.1	1.7	4.9	0.3	0	0.1	1.4	84.5	24.9
1224.10	4,041	7.7	85.5	3.5	2.3	0.2	0	0.03	0.9	92.4	28.3
1224.20	5,000	13.1	75.9	3.0	6.4	0.2	0.1	0.1	1.1	86.8	27.4
1230.10	4,507	6.5	89.7	0.8	1.9	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.7	93.5	30.3
1230.20	3,317	9.4	84.0	1.3	4.4	0.2	0.03	0.2	0.6	90.7	23.7
1231.03	4,223	24.0	63.2	4.0	4.8	0.3	0	0.2	3.6	76.1	29.2
1232.03	4,071	8.9	83.3	3.1	3.1	0.2	0.3	0.2	1.1	91.3	34.0
1232.04	3,479	12.2	79.5	2.7	2.5	0.4	0.03	0.2	2.6	87.9	27.5
1232.05	2,700	12.0	80.8	1.2	2.9	0.1	0	0.5	2.5	88.0	31.4
1232.06	3,017	11.7	83.1	0.8	3.3	0.2	0	0	0.9	88.3	24.6
1233.01	4,800	19.2	45.8	4.5	27.9	0.5	0.1	0.1	2.2	81.1	24.0
1233.03	3,317	22.7	63.0	2.6	7.2	0.1	0.1	0.03	4.3	77.3	26.6
1233.04	4,096	25.4	58.5	4.6	6.8	0.2	0.1	0.3	4.3	74.8	28.1
1234.10	4,487	25.3	60.1	2.6	6.8	0.2	0.4	0.2	4.5	74.8	24.9
1234.20	4,512	25.1	63.0	1.6	4.6	0.4	0.2	0.5	4.7	75.0	26.1
1239.00	6,701	40.9	41.3	6.2	6.8	0.3	0.1	0.4	4.1	59.2	26.2
1241.01	7,509	19.8	66.5	4.4	3.8	0.2	0.2	0.1	5.1	80.3	30.2
1271.01	6,969	23.3	60.1	5.4	7.4	0.2	0.1	0.3	3.3	76.8	27.1
3104.00	3,390	62.5	22.9	1.0	9.4	0.3	0.03	0.2	3.8	37.6	18.4

Census Tract	Population	Percentages									Persons Below Poverty Level
		White	Hispanic	Black/African American	Asian	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Other Non-White	Two or More Races	Total Minority	
3105.00	3,474	24.2	64.4	2.1	5.2	0.3	0.1	0.1	3.5	<b>75.7</b>	<b>24.2</b>
9302.00	750	62.7	30.8	2.5	1.1	1.1	0	0.1	1.7	37.3	10.1

**Bold** text indicates a “minority” or “low-income” population in the census tract.



As can be seen in the discussion presented above, the area surrounding the BLRC would be considered both minority and low-income.

The census data was also examined at the census block level within half a mile and one mile of the Bradley Landfill to determine whether the blocks were predominantly minority or low income. Table 5-3 examines the blocks within a half mile radius of the project site and Table 5-4 examines the blocks within a one mile radius of the project site. As can be seen from these tables, the area surrounding the BLRC at the block level would also be considered both minority and low-income. Within a half mile of the landfill, there are 60 census blocks of which 31 are minority. Within a mile of the project site, there are 196 census blocks, of which 114 are minority. All block groups within one mile of the project site are low-income.

The second step in the determination of environmental justice implications is to determine if the Proposed Project would have any significant adverse effects and if these impacts would disproportionately affect the minority and low-income populations. The following discussion addresses the individual components of the Proposed Project.

#### *Phase I – Vertical Expansion*

Under Phase I of the Proposed Project, the maximum height of the landfill would be raised by 43 feet to a maximum of 1,053 feet msl. Additionally, construction of the TS/MRF, and the expansion of the existing MRF and green and wood waste operations would occur.

Significant adverse impacts that would occur under this phase of the Proposed Project would occur with respect to aesthetics, more specifically to views of the surrounding area, and regional air quality. As discussed in Section 4.6, the vertical expansion of the existing landfill would completely block views of the surrounding mountains from the area south of San Fernando Road (see Figures 4.6-11 and 4.6-12 in Section 4.6). No mitigation measures were identified which would reduce this impact. Impacts related to regional air emissions would result from exceedance of the SCAQMD thresholds for VOC, NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> during this phase of the Proposed Project.

No other significant unavoidable adverse impacts were identified during the EIR process as a result of increasing the maximum height of the landfill. No significant adverse impacts were identified for the construction of the TS/MRF, and the expansion of the existing MRF, and green and wood waste area. Discussion of impacts related to air quality, noise, traffic, etc. can be found in their respective sections of this EIR.

**Table 5-3  
Blocks Within a Half Mile of Bradley Landfill**

Census Tract	Block Group	Block	Population	Percentages									Persons Below Poverty Level <sup>1</sup>	
				White	Hispanic	Black/African American	Asian	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Other Non-White	Two or More Races	Total Minority		
121100	1	1000	5	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.0%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>39.30%</b>
121100	1	1006	20	40.00%	15.00%	0.00%	30.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	5.00%	<b>60.00%</b>		
121100	1	1007	10	70.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	10.00%	0.00%	30.00%		
121100	1	1009	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
121100	1	1010	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
121100	1	1011	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
121100	1	1012	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
121100	1	1013	2	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>50.00%</b>		
121100	1	1014	19	42.11%	57.89%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>57.89%</b>		
121100	1	1015	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
121100	1	1016	16	31.25%	62.50%	6.25%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>68.75%</b>		
121100	1	1017	26	46.15%	46.15%	7.69%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>53.85%</b>		
121100	1	1019	17	58.82%	41.18%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	41.18%		
121100	1	1020	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
121100	1	1021	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
121100	2	2002	70	77.14%	15.71%	0.00%	1.43%	2.86%	0.00%	0.00%	2.86%	22.86%	<b>37.50%</b>	
121100	2	2003	86	65.12%	19.77%	1.16%	11.63%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.33%	34.88%		
121100	2	2004	76	71.05%	13.16%	0.00%	7.89%	0.00%	0.00%	7.89%	0.00%	28.95%		
121100	2	2005	68	61.76%	26.47%	0.00%	4.41%	0.00%	0.00%	5.88%	1.47%	38.24%		
121100	2	2006	100	82.00%	10.00%	1.00%	6.00%	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	0.00%	18.00%		
121100	2	2007	74	68.92%	21.62%	0.00%	4.05%	0.00%	0.00%	1.35%	4.05%	31.08%		
121100	2	2008	32	78.13%	15.63%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.25%	0.00%	21.88%		
121100	2	2009	31	83.37%	0.00%	0.00%	9.68%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.44%	16.13%		

Census Tract	Block Group	Block	Population	Percentages									Persons Below Poverty Level <sup>1</sup>
				White	Hispanic	Black/African American	Asian	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Other Non-White	Two or More Races	Total Minority	
121100	2	2010	56	76.79%	5.36%	0.00%	3.57%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14.29%	23.21%	
121100	2	2011	17	82.35%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	17.65%	0.00%	17.65%	
121100	2	2012	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
121100	2	2013	4	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
121100	2	2014	13	76.92%	30.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	30.00%	
121100	3	3000	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>37.66%</b>
121100	3	3001	11	45.45%	54.55%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>54.55%</b>	
121100	3	3002	30	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>50.00%</b>	
121210	1	1000	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>51.40%</b>
121210	1	1012	209	15.79%	74.16%	5.74%	1.91%	1.91%	0.00%	0.00%	0.48%	<b>84.21%</b>	
121210	1	1027	90	8.89%	67.78%	5.56%	14.44%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.33%	<b>91.11%</b>	
121210	2	2000	856	1.64%	95.44%	1.29%	1.52%	0.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>98.36%</b>	<b>63.64%</b>
121210	2	2001	1580	5.51%	89.24%	3.80%	0.63%	0.19%	0.00%	0.00%	0.63%	<b>94.49%</b>	
121210	2	2002	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
121210	2	2007	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
121210	2	2008	73	26.03%	54.79%	0.00%	17.81%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.37%	<b>73.97%</b>	
121220	1	1000	51	1.96%	98.04%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>98.04%</b>	<b>69.37%</b>
121220	1	1001	299	11.37%	86.62%	0.00%	1.00%	0.33%	0.00%	0.33%	0.33%	<b>88.63%</b>	
121220	1	1002	55	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>100.00%</b>	
121220	1	1003	97	7.22%	92.78%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>92.78%</b>	
121220	1	1004	194	14.95%	70.62%	0.00%	12.37%	0.00%	0.00%	1.55%	0.52%	<b>85.05%</b>	
121220	1	1005	44	25.00%	65.91%	2.27%	6.82%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>75.00%</b>	
121220	1	1006	115	38.26%	41.74%	6.96%	10.43%	1.74%	0.00%	0.00%	0.87%	<b>61.74%</b>	
121220	1	1007	110	9.09%	70.91%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>90.91%</b>	
121220	1	1008	68	19.12%	57.35%	0.00%	23.53%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>80.88%</b>	
121220	2	2000	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>40.89%</b>

Census Tract	Block Group	Block	Population	Percentages									Persons Below Poverty Level <sup>a</sup>	
				White	Hispanic	Black/African American	Asian	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Other Non-White	Two or More Races	Total Minority		
121220	2	2001	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
121220	2	2002	20	45.00%	40.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%	<b>55.00%</b>	
121220	2	2003	73	2.74%	83.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	13.70%	<b>97.26%</b>	
121220	2	2004	87	11.49%	75.86%	0.00%	12.64%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>88.51%</b>	
121220	2	2005	106	19.81%	78.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.89%	<b>80.19%</b>	
121220	2	2006	110	6.36%	93.64%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>93.64%</b>	
121220	2	2007	18	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>100.00%</b>	
121220	2	2008	210	9.52%	85.71%	0.48%	3.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.95%	<b>90.48%</b>	
121220	2	2009	88	12.50%	77.27%	0.00%	10.23%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>87.50%</b>	
121220	2	2016	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
121220	2	2017	6	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	83.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>100.00%</b>	

a. The percentage of the population below the poverty level is based upon data at the block group level, as the data is not available at the block level. A copy of this information can be found in Appendix J-2.

**Table 5-4  
Blocks Within One Mile of Bradley Landfill**

Census Tract	Block Group	Block	Population	Percentages									Persons Below Poverty Level <sup>a</sup>
				White	Hispanic	Black/African American	Asian	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Other Non-White	Two or More Races	Total Minority	
102101	9	9002	1,792	59.49%	29.30%	2.96%	5.36%	0.28%	0.11%	0.61%	1.90%	40.51%	<b>34.95%</b>
102101	9	9004	136	5.88%	86.03%	5.15%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.21%	0.74%	<b>94.12%</b>	
102101	9	9005	102	56.86%	18.63%	0.00%	19.61%	0.98%	0.00%	0.00%	3.9%	43.14%	
102101	9	9006	7	42.86%	57.14%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>57.14%</b>	
102101	9	9007	36	66.67%	16.67%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%	
102101	9	9018	51	70.59%	17.65%	0.00%	7.84%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.92%	29.41%	
102101	9	9022	41	82.93%	12.20%	0.00%	2.44%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.44%	17.07%	
102101	9	9023	43	81.40%	11.63%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.98%	18.60%	
103300	2	2002	38	68.42%	26.32%	0.00%	5.26%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	31.58%	<b>24.31%</b>
103300	2	2003	53	88.68%	5.66%	1.89%	3.77%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.32%	
103300	2	2004	81	79.01%	19.75%	0.00%	1.23%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.99%	
103300	2	2005	150	86.67%	11.33%	0.00%	0.00%	1.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.67%	13.33%	
103300	2	2008	76	90.79%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.32%	0.00%	0.00%	7.89%	9.21%	
103300	2	2009	73	93.15%	6.85%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.85%	
103300	2	2010	45	86.67%	6.67%	0.00%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	13.33%	
103300	2	2011	25	36.00%	28.00%	0.00%	12.00%	0.00%	0.00%	24.00%	0.00%	<b>64.00%</b>	
104702	3	3001	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>80.83%</b>
104702	3	3003	223	6.28%	93.72%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>93.72%</b>	
104702	3	3004	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
121010	1	1001	172	16.28%	63.95%	4.07%	15.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>83.72%</b>	<b>57.22%</b>
121010	2	2000	199	19.10%	57.79%	1.01%	14.57%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.54%	<b>58.00%</b>
121010	2	2001	2	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>100.00%</b>	
121010	2	2002	42	23.81%	76.19%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>76.19%</b>	
121010	2	2008	105	19.05%	80.95%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>80.95%</b>	

Census Tract	Block Group	Block	Population	Percentages									Persons Below Poverty Level <sup>3</sup>	
				White	Hispanic	Black/African American	Asian	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Other Non-White	Two or More Races	Total Minority		
121010	2	2009	120	13.33%	84.17%	0.00%	2.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>86.67%</b>	
121010	2	2012	148	22.97%	66.89%	2.70%	6.08%	0.68%	0.00%	0.00%	0.68%	<b>77.03%</b>		
121010	2	2013	114	46.49%	35.96%	3.51%	8.77%	0.88%	0.00%	0.00%	4.39%	<b>53.51%</b>		
121100	1	1000	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>39.30%</b>
121100	1	1002	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
121100	1	1003	2	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>50.00%</b>		
121100	1	1004	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
121100	1	1005	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
121100	1	1008	9	66.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.33%		
121100	1	1018	183	26.23%	58.47%	0.00%	13.66%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.64%	<b>73.77%</b>		
121100	1	1022	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
121100	1	1023	65	72.31%	18.46%	6.15%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.08%	27.69%		
121100	1	1024	27	70.37%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.41%	29.63%		
121100	1	1025	42	80.95%	19.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	19.05%		
121100	1	1026	96	85.42%	9.38%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.21%	14.58%		
121100	1	1027	137	58.39%	33.58%	0.00%	2.92%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.11%	41.61%		
121100	1	1028	57	43.86%	45.61%	8.77%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.75%	<b>56.14%</b>		
121100	2	2000	11	63.64%	36.36%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	36.36%	<b>37.50%</b>	
121100	2	2001	22	86.36%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.55%	13.64%		
121100	3	3003	210	26.19%	65.71%	0.00%	6.19%	0.48%	0.00%	0.00%	1.43%	<b>73.81%</b>	<b>37.66%</b>	
121100	3	3004	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
121100	3	3005	106	26.42%	44.34%	0.00%	27.36%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.89%	<b>73.58%</b>		
121100	3	3006	136	11.03%	60.29%	0.74%	26.47%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.47%	<b>88.97%</b>		
121100	3	3007	203	18.23%	72.41%	2.96%	6.40%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.99%	<b>82.76%</b>		
121100	3	3008	115	10.43%	89.57%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>89.57%</b>		
121100	3	3009	141	1.42%	92.20%	0.00%	6.38%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>98.58%</b>	<b>52.48%</b>	
121100	4	4003	140	7.14%	81.43%	0.00%	7.14%	1.43%	0.00%	0.00%	2.86%	<b>92.86%</b>		

Census Tract	Block Group	Block	Population	Percentages									Persons Below Poverty Level <sup>3</sup>
				White	Hispanic	Black/African American	Asian	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Other Non-White	Two or More Races	Total Minority	
121100	4	4004	295	8.81%	80.68%	0.34%	9.49%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.68%	<b>91.19%</b>	
121100	4	4011	30	16.67%	66.67%	0.00%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10.00%	<b>83.33%</b>	
121100	4	4013	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
121100	4	4014	6	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>66.67%</b>	
121210	1	1003	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>51.40%</b>
121210	1	1009	126	16.67%	62.70%	4.76%	10.32%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.56%	<b>83.33%</b>	
121210	1	1010	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
121210	1	1011	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
121210	1	1013	90	15.56%	65.56%	0.00%	18.89%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>84.44%</b>	
121210	1	1014	109	23.85%	60.55%	0.92%	12.84%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.86%	<b>76.15%</b>	
121210	1	1015	117	26.50%	43.59%	0.00%	23.08%	3.42%	0.00%	0.00%	3.42%	<b>73.50%</b>	
121210	1	1016	108	29.63%	46.30%	3.70%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.70%	<b>70.37%</b>	
121210	1	1017	128	33.59%	45.31%	0.00%	17.19%	3.13%	0.00%	0.00%	0.78%	<b>66.41%</b>	
121210	1	1018	180	15.00%	62.22%	0.00%	20.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.22%	<b>85.00%</b>	
121210	1	1019	107	10.28%	60.75%	0.00%	25.23%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.74%	<b>89.72%</b>	
121210	1	1020	81	28.40%	46.91%	0.00%	23.46%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.23%	<b>71.60%</b>	
121210	1	1026	99	13.13%	70.71%	1.01%	15.15%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>86.87%</b>	
121210	2	2003	8	25.00%	37.50%	0.00%	37.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>75.00%</b>	
121210	2	2004	208	7.69%	65.87%	1.92%	19.23%	0.48%	0.00%	0.96%	3.85%	<b>92.31%</b>	
121210	2	2005	134	21.64%	64.18%	0.00%	8.96%	0.75%	0.00%	0.00%	4.48%	<b>78.36%</b>	
121210	2	2006	86	12.79%	75.58%	0.00%	11.63%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>87.21%</b>	
121210	2	2009	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
121210	2	2010	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
121220	2	2010	62	6.45%	80.65%	11.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.61%	<b>93.55%</b>	<b>40.89%</b>
121220	2	2011	30	26.67%	73.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>73.33%</b>	
121220	2	2012	73	17.81%	75.34%	5.48%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.37%	<b>82.19%</b>	
121220	2	2013	107	10.28%	71.96%	0.00%	14.02%	0.00%	2.80%	0.00%	0.93%	<b>89.72%</b>	

Census Tract	Block Group	Block	Population	Percentages									Persons Below Poverty Level <sup>1</sup>	
				White	Hispanic	Black/African American	Asian	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Other Non-White	Two or More Races	Total Minority		
121220	2	2014	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
121220	2	2015	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
121220	2	2018	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
121220	2	2019	106	21.70%	78.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>78.30%</b>	
121220	2	2020	127	19.69%	68.50%	0.00%	11.02%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.79%	<b>80.31%</b>	
121220	2	2021	136	15.44%	73.53%	0.00%	3.68%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.35%	<b>84.56%</b>	
121220	2	2022	126	6.35%	86.51%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>93.65%</b>	
121220	3	3000	101	20.79%	61.36%	0.00%	17.82%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>79.21%</b>	<b>56.03%</b>
121220	3	3001	33	12.12%	75.76%	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.03%	<b>87.88%</b>	
121220	3	3002	121	3.31%	94.21%	0.00%	2.48%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>96.69%</b>	
121220	3	3003	87	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>100.00%</b>	
121220	3	3004	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
121220	3	3005	186	1.08%	98.92%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>98.92%</b>	
121220	3	3006	138	10.87%	86.96%	2.17%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>89.13%</b>	
121220	3	3007	226	5.31%	75.66%	0.00%	11.06%	0.00%	5.31%	1.77%	0.88%	0.88%	<b>94.69%</b>	
121220	3	3008	95	13.68%	62.11%	0.00%	17.89%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.32%	<b>86.32%</b>	
121220	3	3009	130	17.69%	70.77%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.54%	<b>82.31%</b>	
121220	3	3010	107	20.56%	70.09%	0.00%	6.54%	0.00%	1.87%	0.00%	0.00%	0.93%	<b>79.44%</b>	
121220	3	3011	127	12.60%	81.10%	2.36%	2.36%	1.57%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>87.40%</b>	
121220	3	3012	135	15.56%	79.26%	0.74%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.44%	<b>84.44%</b>	
121220	3	3013	106	8.49%	83.96%	0.00%	7.55%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>91.51%</b>	
121800	1	1000	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>60.96%</b>
121800	1	1001	70	24.29%	65.71%	0.00%	8.57%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.43%	<b>75.71%</b>	
121800	1	1002	136	11.76%	73.53%	0.00%	8.82%	0.00%	0.00%	0.74%	5.15%	5.15%	<b>88.24%</b>	
121800	1	1003	81	25.93%	67.90%	0.00%	6.17%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>74.07%</b>	
121800	1	1004	108	13.89%	82.41%	3.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>86.11%</b>	
121800	1	1005	84	22.62%	64.29%	10.71%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.38%	<b>77.38%</b>	



Census Tract	Block Group	Block	Population	Percentages									Persons Below Poverty Level <sup>3</sup>	
				White	Hispanic	Black/African American	Asian	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Other Non-White	Two or More Races	Total Minority		
121800	1	1006	84	14.29%	83.33%	0.00%	2.38%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	85.71%	
121800	1	1007	17	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	
121800	1	1008	6	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	
121800	1	1009	57	7.02%	89.47%	0.00%	3.51%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	92.98%	
121800	1	1010	221	4.98%	94.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.90%	95.02%	
121800	1	1011	87	33.33%	59.77%	0.00%	4.60%	1.15%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.15%	66.67%	
121900	1	1000	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.97%
121900	1	1001	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
121900	1	1002	6	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	
121900	1	1003	55	14.60%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.60%	85.60%	
121900	1	1004	96	9.40%	90.60%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	90.60%	
121900	1	1005	78	12.80%	80.80%	0.00%	6.40%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	87.20%	
121900	1	1006	3	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	
121900	1	1007	368	58.70%	33.70%	3.00%	1.90%	1.10%	0.27%	0.00%	0.00%	1.40%	41.37%	
121900	1	1008	215	16.30%	68.40%	0.00%	7.00%	0.93%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.40%	83.73%	
121900	1	1009	103	21.40%	54.40%	0.00%	5.80%	2.90%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	15.50%	78.60%	
122110	2	2000	1	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	76.36%
122110	2	2002	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
122110	2	2003	11	27.27%	72.73%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	72.73%	
122110	2	2004	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
122110	2	2005	5	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
122110	2	2006	163	5.52%	94.48%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	94.48%	
122110	2	2007	98	2.04%	97.96%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	97.96%	
122110	2	2008	163	6.75%	88.96%	0.00%	0.00%	0.61%	1.23%	0.00%	0.00%	2.45%	93.25%	
122110	2	2009	6	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
122110	2	2016	73	6.85%	93.15%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	93.15%	
122200	1	1000	59	52.54%	30.51%	6.78%	10.17%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	47.46%	54.11%

Census Tract	Block Group	Block	Population	Percentages									Persons Below Poverty Level <sup>a</sup>	
				White	Hispanic	Black/African American	Asian	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Other Non-White	Two or More Races	Total Minority		
122200	1	1001	13	76.92%	23.08%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	23.08%	
122200	1	1002	26	30.77%	53.85%	0.00%	15.38%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	<b>69.23%</b>	
122200	1	1003	48	54.17%	37.50%	0.00%	2.08%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.25%	45.83%	
122200	1	1004	23	73.91%	21.74%	0.00%	4.35%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	26.09%	
<p>a. The percentage of the population below the poverty level is based upon data at the block group level, as the data is not available at the block level. A copy of this information can be found in Appendix J-2.</p>														

These impacts associated with Phase I of the Proposed Project would combine with the effects of other existing and proposed industrial uses located in Sun Valley to result in disproportionate effects on a low income and minority community. In an attempt to offset these impacts, the project applicant has proposed the establishment of a Community Fund for Sun Valley to be financed by a portion of revenues (i.e., “host” fee) that would be generated by the proposed transitional vertical expansion if approved. The proposed “host” fee would be \$2 for each ton of municipal solid waste accepted at the landfill prior to closure of the landfill in April 2007. At the projected additional capacity of approximately 3.5 million tons of MSW that would be provided by the proposed transitional vertical expansion (see Section 3.0, Project Description), up to \$7 million could be generated for this fund as a result of the Proposed Project. The fund would be used to support long-term improvements in the Sun Valley Community.

In addition, a Community Advisory Committee (CAC), funded by the applicant, was formed in May, 2003 to provide a forum for community input on the Proposed Project, ways to improve the community, and current operations at the landfill. The CAC was formed in conjunction with the City Councilmember within whose District the project site is located and meets monthly. The CAC has received information and provided input on numerous issues, including: current operations, groundwater, seismic safety and radioactivity, liner systems, “green” recycling and transfer facility, asthma impacts, positions of the East Valley Coalition, mitigation measures, generator noise, closure and post-closure requirements, the EIR process and environmental justice. In addition to the project applicant and other technical staff members from Waste Management, persons appearing before the CAC have included District 2 and District 7 City Councilmembers, City Attorney staff, members of the East Valley Coalition, and staff members of the City Bureau of Sanitation and the California Integrated Waste Management Board. The CAC will continue to meet monthly throughout the EIR process and beyond in order to continue to address impacts to the community as a result of existing operations at BLRC and the Proposed Project.

#### *Phase II – Landfill Closure and Transfer Station/MRF Operations*

Under Phase II of the Proposed Project, the existing landfill would be closed and a 4,000 tpd TS and 1,000 tpd MRF would replace the current landfill operations. A detailed description of these activities can be found in Section 3.0, Project Description.

Under Phase II of the Proposed Project, the anticipated significant unavoidable adverse impacts resulting from the Proposed Project include aesthetic and local and regional air quality impacts. These impacts are discussed in the aesthetic and air quality sections of the EIR. No other significant unavoidable adverse impacts associated with the closure of the landfill have been identified. Except for Regional NO<sub>x</sub> emissions, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts were identified as a result of operating the TS/MRF.

### **Cumulative Environmental Justice Effects**

Development of the industrial core of Sun Valley, generally consisting of the area located between San Fernando Road and Glenoaks Boulevard, between Branford Street and Tuxford Street, has occurred over the past 50 to 60 years and has resulted in a concentration of heavy industrial activities, including the BLRC, that have relatively high levels of impact related to traffic, noise, air quality, visual quality and hazardous materials use. This development has occurred in accordance with the provisions of the City's General Plan and the Sun Valley – La Tuna Canyon Community Plan, which designated this area of the City for development with industrial uses. The land use pattern which has evolved in this area over the years is also reflective of the policies of the General Plan Framework Element and predecessor elements that encompassed City-wide land use policies that recognize that the City needs to provide some areas that can accommodate industrial development. When the landfill was originally established, very few residential homes existed in the area.

Although City land use plans have called for the concentration of industrial development in this area of the City, the plans also now reflect nearby residential land uses that have developed over time. These neighborhoods, which would be characterized under the USEPA guidance as predominantly minority and low-income, are presently affected by the impacts associated with the concentration of industrial uses in Sun Valley. Moreover, since concentrations of industrial activity as occurs in Sun Valley are not present throughout the City, but rather concentrated in specific areas of the City, the effects are disproportionately experienced by the minority and low income communities in and adjacent to the Sun Valley industrial core, along with all other residents of the area.

Two approaches are available that can potentially address the effects on these residential communities that have resulted from the long-term development patterns within Sun Valley. First, individual industrial uses within the Sun Valley industrial core can implement measures that reduce their impacts over time. Such measures would be identified and incorporated into existing uses largely through the expansion of environmental regulations and requirements and application of such requirements to existing uses (i.e., “grandfathering” of existing uses not permitted). The City can also improve conditions within the Sun Valley area by requiring the implementation of feasible mitigation measures through the enforcement of the CEQA process for new projects or the expansion of existing facilities. Any such improvements in environmental effects would be the result of regulatory action at the Federal, State and local levels, as well as through the development and implementation of the State's environmental justice policies (particularly the implementation of the “precautionary” EJ strategies discussed above). The CAC process described above is a mechanism for providing input into the requirements for existing uses.

Second, as past and present uses turn over and are replaced by new uses over time, such new uses are required to conform to more modern environmental standards, and could include uses that are generally less impactful than the uses they replace (i.e., light industrial or commercial, rather than heavy industrial). This latter process could be facilitated through the long term land planning mechanisms that are available to the City of Los Angeles, if the City were to revise the Framework Element and Sun Valley – La Tuna Canyon Community Plan to reflect a vision of the Sun Valley industrial core that designates the area for development with uses that have lesser impacts than those that presently exist. The initial steps that have been taken to possibly form a Sun Valley Environmental Justice Area, pursuant to City Council motion,

as discussed above, would also be consistent with this approach. The Proposed Project would be contributing to such a process of transition to the character of the Sun Valley industrial core by replacing an existing use (landfill) with a less impactful use (TS/MRF) which will be an entirely enclosed state of the art facility with environmental protection measures such as a bio-filter for odor control. The CAC and Community Fund for Sun Valley described above would contribute to this process as well and could be used for improvement projects not otherwise reasonably related to the Proposed Project. If the City chooses to employ an areawide strategy to reduce the cumulatively considerable EJ effects that are currently present in Sun Valley, it must be recognized that, just as the present character of the area has evolved over a period of many decades, this transition would also require an extended period of time to take place.

Thus, because of the existing concentration of industrial uses in the Sun Valley area, the Proposed Project will contribute to environmental justice concerns already facing the community. In an attempt to help off-set the larger ongoing environmental justice issues, the project applicant has distributed the notice of the Proposed Project, in both Spanish and English, to known residents within an approximately three mile radius of the site, has funded the formation of the local Community Advisory Committee, has included a host fee to be used to benefit the greater community, and will abide by the mitigation measures required as part of the Proposed Project. The environmental justice effects, however, are not considered to be significant impacts to the physical environment as that term is presently defined under CEQA.