

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
ROOM 615, CITY HALL
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

INITIAL STUDY AND CHECKLIST

(Article IV – City CEQA Guidelines)

LEAD CITY AGENCY Department of City Planning	COUNCIL DISTRICT 7	DATE September, 2002
RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES City of Los Angeles Environmental Affairs Department, City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation; South Coast Air Quality Management District; Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board; California Integrated Waste Management Board		
PROJECT TITLE/NO. <i>Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center Transition Master Plan</i>		CASE NO.
PREVIOUS ACTIONS CASE NO. 94-0792-ZV	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DOES have significant changes from previous actions. <input type="checkbox"/> DOES NOT have significant changes from previous actions.	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: <i>See attached</i>		
ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING: <i>See attached</i>		
PROJECT LOCATION See attached.		
PLANNING DISTRICT Sun Valley-La Tuna Canyon Community	STATUS: <input type="checkbox"/> PRELIMINARY <input type="checkbox"/> PROPOSED _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ADOPTED _____ date	
EXISTING ZONING M2-1, M2-1G, M3-1G	MAX. DENSITY ZONING N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DOES CONFORM TO PLAN <input type="checkbox"/> DOES NOT CONFORM TO PLAN <input type="checkbox"/> NO DISTRICT PLAN
PLANNED LAND USE & ZONE Heavy Industrial (Refuse Collection Yard)	MAX. DENSITY PLAN N/A	
SURROUNDING LAND USES Industrial	PROJECT DENSITY N/A	

DETERMINATION (To be completed by Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

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

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

SIGNATURE

TITLE

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or

more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of a mitigation measure has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analysis,” cross referenced).
- 5) Earlier analysis must be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR, or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - 1) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - 2) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - 3) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A sources list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whichever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - 1) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - 2) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing | |

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST (To be completed by the Lead City Agency)

**BACKGROUND****PROPONENT NAME***Waste Management Recycling & Disposal Services of California, Inc.***PHONE NUMBER****PROPONENT ADDRESS***9081 Tujunga Ave, Sun Valley CA 91352***AGENCY REQUIRING CHECKLIST***City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning***DATE SUBMITTED****PROPOSAL NAME (If Applicable)***Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center Transition Master Plan*

Project Location/Environmental Setting

The Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center (BLRC) is a Class III municipal solid waste disposal and recycling facility located in the Sun Valley District of the City of Los Angeles at 9227 Tujunga Avenue (see Figure 1). The project site is irregularly shaped and roughly bounded by a Los Angeles Department of Water and Power transmission line right-of-way, Glenoaks Boulevard, Tujunga Avenue, Peoria Street, Bradley Avenue, and the old Southern Pacific Railroad/MetroLink Rail Line (see Figure 2).

The land uses surrounding the BLRC consist primarily of industrial activities. These industrial land uses include: both active and closed landfills, auto salvage yards, inactive sand and gravel pits, and aggregate processing plants. The nearest area zoned for residential use is located approximately 1,500 feet from the edge of the landfill, across San Fernando Road from the project site. The nearest residential unit is located approximately 500 feet from the edge of the landfill in an area that is currently zoned M1-1. Residences located in this area are considered by the City to be legal non-conforming uses.

The BLRC is a 209-acre facility that consists of two major sub-areas: Bradley West and West Extension (the project site), and Bradley East. Bradley West and West Extension are the areas of the landfill that are actively receiving municipal solid waste for disposal. Under the General Plan, the area is designated as "heavy industrial." Bradley West and West Extension are currently zoned as M2-1, M2-1G, and M3-1G (Industrial) and operate under Plan Approvals granted by the City: Case No. ZA 92-0002(ZV) with modifications contained in Case No. ZA 94-0792(ZV); and California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) Solid Waste Facility (SWF) Permit No. 19-AR-0008.

Bradley East is an inactive portion of the landfill that disposed of MSW from 1958 to 1980. Inert wastes were disposed of between 1987 and 1993. This area is currently used for wood waste and green waste recycling activities, landfill operations support, and electrical generation using landfill gas.

The BLRC currently accepts residential, commercial, and industrial solid waste that is generated throughout the greater Los Angeles area. The facility does NOT accept hazardous, radioactive, or untreated medical waste(s). The landfill is permitted to accept up to 10,000 tons of solid waste for disposal per day (tpd), seven days per week and has historically received between 450 and 500 trucks per day. The landfill currently operates Monday through Friday, 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. and Saturday 7:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. The site is permitted to operate through the year 2007; however, expected market demand, coupled with the current rate of waste acceptance, will result in the landfill reaching capacity during 2003.

Environmental controls have been installed to meet State and Federal regulations. Landfill gas emissions and migration are controlled by a network of collection wells, header pipes, and three flares.

Proposed Project Description

Waste Management has developed a plan to assist Los Angeles in future waste disposal and recycling needs. The plan consists of two phases. The first phase is a transitional 43 foot vertical landfill expansion that will provide additional short term disposal capacity within the boundaries of the existing landfill. The second phase will consist of a 6,000 tpd transfer station and 1,000 tpd Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) that will be constructed adjacent to the existing landfill. The purpose of this plan is to provide for an orderly transition of BLRC from an active landfill to a transfer station/MRF operation that will process solid waste for transport to other regional landfills and recycled materials processing facilities. If an end disposal site is located and the proposed transfer station/MRF project is approved, transport may occur via rail at some point in the future. However, this possibility is only speculative at this time and additional environmental review would need to be performed if such an end disposal site is located and permitted. Performance of this additional environmental review would be dependent upon the characteristics of the end disposal site that would be accessed by rail.

Phase I

Under Phase I of the plan, the applicant proposes to increase the maximum height of the landfill from 1010 to 1,053 feet above mean sea level (msl)¹, in order to allow time for transition to the transfer station/MRF operation. Proposed grade contours associated with the transitional height increase are shown in Figure 3. The height increase will create an additional 4.7 million cubic yards of disposal capacity and allow the landfill to operate until the established closure date of April 14, 2007. The appearance of the site with the proposed height increase will be the same as the current appearance, only higher.

During Phase I, the landfill will continue to use existing facilities and environmental controls. No changes to existing landfill operations or procedures will be required. The landfill will continue to operate under the conditions set forth under City Case No. 94-0472 (ZV) and SWF Permit No. 19-AR-0008. The only change requested for Phase I would be the increase in permitted height.

¹ All references to the maximum height of the landfill refer to the maximum elevation to which the top of the landfill is permitted to extend. When the top of the landfill reaches this maximum elevation, landfill operations would no longer be permitted and the landfill would be closed in accordance with regulatory requirements that govern landfill closures. Subsequent to closure, natural settlement would continue to take place within the landfill, such that the elevation of top of the landfill would actually reduce below the maximum permitted elevation over time. Once the landfill is closed, no further disposal will be permitted even if the top of the landfill settles below the maximum permitted elevation. All references in this document to the maximum elevation pertain to the landfill height prior to post-closure settlement.

Phase I of the proposed Master Plan would also encompass activities associated with closing the landfill. These would include: (1) installing a 4-foot soil cap over all surfaces of the landfill; (2) planting of vegetation on all slopes, as well as the landfill cap; and (3) constructing surface water control structures.

Phase II

Under Phase II of the proposed Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center Transition Master Plan, the applicant proposes to construct a 6,000 tons per day transfer station and 1,000 tons per day MRF to replace the current landfill operation. As the landfill capacity is depleted, the applicant proposes to transition the existing landfill operation into a transfer station/MRF operation where solid waste and commercial/residential recyclable materials will be received, consolidated and transported to other regional landfills and recycled materials processing facilities. The proposed location of the transfer station/MRF building within the boundaries of the BLRC is shown in Figure 3.

The transfer station/MRF facility will 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 existing entrance, scales, and internal roads will be used for the transfer station/MRF operations. All roads leading to the transfer station and aprons around the transfer station will be paved and will be capable of accommodating the projected number of trash trucks, recycling collection trucks and private vehicles that would be expected to bring materials into the facility on a daily basis, along with the projected daily number of transfer trucks and other trucks (e.g., flatbed trucks and other transport trucks) that would remove trash and recycled materials from the facility. No demolition would be required as part of this phase.

The transfer station/MRF will consist of a three-sided building with the open side facing the landfill. This building will be metal sided with two distinct tipping areas separated by the MRF. A small one story metal building will be located adjacent to the transfer station and will be used primarily for employee services. Employee parking will be provided adjacent to this building and will include sufficient spaces for all employees associated with the transfer station/MRF operation.

The transfer station facility will be designed to receive and transfer up to 6,000 tons per day of solid waste. All incoming disposal trucks will dump their loads within the buildings. Trucks carrying trash will tip on one of the two transfer floors. Two loading wells will be located at each tipping area for top loading transfer trucks. The loading areas for the transfer trucks are located below the grade of the tipping floors. The trash will either be directly loaded by front end loader into a transfer truck, or temporarily stored until a transfer truck is available. As noted above, rail transfer from the transfer station may become an option in the future, but would be dependent upon the characteristics of the end disposal site and the rail transfer system developed to serve the end disposal site.

The MRF will be designed to process up to 1,000 tons per day of glass, cardboard, mixed paper, metal, aluminum and plastic materials. Recycled materials will either be part of a co-mingled single waste stream or separated from trash at their source. Trucks with recyclable material and mixed loads will tip on the MRF floor. Recyclable materials will be processed and stored until sufficient material is available for transport. Residual waste will be pushed or conveyed into the transfer station and loaded into transfer trucks. Processed materials in a loose form will be stored until sufficient quantities are available for baling. Processed material in a baled form will be stored in a fenced storage area. This area will allow for up to one week of material storage. Loose material (glass) will be stored in 40 cubic yard open top containers until shipped to buyers. A daily review of processed material inventory and shipment schedules will be performed by facility personnel to assure that full loads of baled and loose material will be shipped in a timely manner in order to maintain minimum inventory of processed materials.

As many former landfill jobs as possible will be transitioned into jobs at the transfer station. The proposed transition from a landfill operation to a transfer station/MRF operation under the Master Plan would increase employment on the project site by approximately 30 to 40 jobs. Table 1 summarizes the parameters for the proposed transfer station/MRF.

Table 1
BLRC Transfer Station Proposed Project Parameters

Use	Parameter
Transfer Station	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use: Incoming trucks discharge to tipping floor where waste is consolidated and re-loaded into transfer trucks for transport to other regional landfills. • Maximum 55,000 square feet • Maximum height: 55' above lowest grade • Hours of operation: 6 a.m. to midnight daily. Waste accepted for disposal between 6 a.m. and 8 p.m. • Four truck loading wells for outgoing transfer trucks
Material Recovery Facility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use: Incoming trucks discharge single source and pre-separated materials to tipping floor where recyclables are removed and processed. • Maximum 40,000 square feet. • Mechanical sorting and processing equipment.
Support Building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use: office, break room, rest rooms • Maximum 2,500 square feet • Maximum height: 15 feet
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50 employee spaces

Required Entitlements

Entitlements for the Proposed Project could include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Project plan approval to permit increase in the maximum height of the landfill from 1,010 above msl to 1,053 feet above msl, in order to allow time for transition to the transfer station/MRF operation.
- Solid Waste Facility Permits for transitional landfill expansion and transfer station/MRF.
- Waste Discharge Requirements for transitional landfill expansion.
- Air permit for transitional landfill expansion.
- Waste water discharge permit for transfer station/MRF.

Figure 1, Regional Map

Figure 2, Project Location Map

Figure 3, Conceptual Site Plan

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

(Explanations of all potentially and less than significant impacts are required to be attached on separate sheets)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, or other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural feature within a city-designated scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict the existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
III. AIR QUALITY. The significance criteria established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project result in:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the SCAQMD or Congestion Management Plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the air basin is non-attainment (ozone, carbon monoxide, & PM 10) under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in the City or regional plans, policies, regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh vernal pool, coastal, etc.) Through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance (e.g., oak trees or California walnut woodlands)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a. Exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving :	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potential result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. | Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. | Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. | Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. | Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. | For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. | For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for the people residing or working in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g. | Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h. | Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. | Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. | Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre- | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned land uses for which permits have been granted)?				
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood plain as mapped on federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Place within a 100-year flood plain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, inquiry or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XI. NOISE. Would the project:				
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise in level in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of people to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Fire protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Police protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Other governmental services (including roads)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

XIV. RECREATION.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

XV. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to ratio capacity on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
results in substantial safety risks?				
d. Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XVI. UTILITIES. Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resource, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
- b. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects).
- c. Does the project have environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

DISCUSSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

PREPARED BY	TITLE	TELEPHONE #	DATE
-------------	-------	-------------	------

I AESTHETICS

I a Aesthetics (scenic vistas)

The project site is located in an area that presently contains some views of the surrounding Verdugo Mountains, which are located to the east of the existing landfill site. Views of the ridgelines of these mountains are available from some streets and locations within the residential areas west of the existing landfill site. Phase I of the Proposed Project would raise the maximum height of the existing landfill by 43 feet, prior to post-closure settlement, to a height of 1,053 feet above mean sea level (msl). This would allow the landfill to continue operations at the currently permitted rate until projected closure in 2007. Phase II of the Proposed Project would convert the existing landfill operations into a transfer station/MRF operation on or before the landfill closure date of April 14, 2007 and would not have the potential to block existing views. With the proposed increase in landfill height under Phase I of the Master Plan, the top area of the landfill would have the potential to extend into portions of existing view lines to the mountains and affect existing views. This potential impact will be addressed in the EIR.

I b Aesthetics (scenic resources)

No scenic resources, including trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, are located on or in the vicinity of the Proposed Project site. The project site is also not within a state scenic highway. No impact to scenic resources would occur.

I c Aesthetics (visual character)

Landfill operations have been conducted on the project site since 1959 and the site has also been used as a gravel and sand quarry. The visual character of the surrounding area is defined by primarily industrial land uses including both active and closed landfills, auto salvage yards, inactive sand and gravel pits, aggregate processing plants, a City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power generating plant and a general aviation airport. The edges of the landfill property are landscaped and maintained for litter control. The increased height of the landfill under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan would have the potential to result in changes in the visual environment of the area. This potential impact will be discussed in the EIR. Operational portions of Phase II buildings will face away from surrounding uses or will be located below the existing grade and will not be visible from most locations outside the boundaries of the BLRC.

I d Aesthetics (light and glare)

The existing Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center is bounded on all sides by roadways, which have existing street lighting. Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, in the event that

landfill operations occur at night, portable, temporary lighting would be brought in.¹ Additional lighting sources, including building, security and parking lot lighting would be associated with the transfer station/MRF building under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan. The open side of the transfer station will face towards the landfill, away from San Fernando Road. In addition, parking, loading and recycling storage facilities would be located below surrounding grades. Additional light sources associated with both Phase I and Phase II would be located only in interior areas of the site where work is occurring and would be directed inward and focused within the project site. Because of these design features, effects of new lighting sources would not likely be perceptible outside of the project site. Impacts of the Proposed Project related to light and glare would be less than significant.

II AGRICULTURE

II a Agriculture (conversion of designated farmland)

According to the Los Angeles County Important Farmland Map, the project site is not included in the Important Farmland category.² The project site has been used for landfill operations since 1959 and does not include any State-designated agricultural lands. No impact on farmland or agricultural resources would occur.

II b Agriculture (conflict with agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contract)

The project site has been used for landfill operations since 1959. It is not zoned for agricultural use, nor is it subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The Proposed Project would not involve the conversion of agricultural land to another use. Therefore, the Proposed Project would have no impact to agricultural resources.

II c Agriculture (conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use)

Neither the project site nor nearby properties are currently utilized for agricultural activities, and as discussed in Section II a, the site is not classified as "Important Farmland" by the State of California. In addition, no surrounding properties are presently designated for agricultural use. No impact to the conversion of Farmland would occur.

¹ Environmental Assessment Form submitted for 9227 Tujunga Avenue, Sun Valley, California 91352.

² Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Los Angeles County Important Farmland Map 1998.

III AIR QUALITY

III a Air Quality (implementation of air quality plans)

Activities associated with both Phase I and Phase II of the proposed Master Plan would have the potential to result in generation of air emissions. Emissions could be associated with truck traffic, equipment operation, earth movement, landfill gas processing systems and employee traffic. Emissions associated with such activities and the relationship of projected emission levels to the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the South Coast Air Basin will be discussed in the EIR.

III b Air Quality (violation of air quality standards)

Activities associated with both Phase I and Phase II of the proposed Master Plan would have the potential to generate air emissions. Emissions could be associated with truck traffic, equipment operation, earth movement, landfill gas processing systems and employee traffic. Emissions associated with such activities and the relationship of projected emission levels to applicable air quality standards will be discussed in the EIR.

III c Air Quality (increased emission of criteria pollutants)

Under procedures set forth in the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA Handbook, significance thresholds have been established for criteria pollutants for which the South Coast Air Basin is currently designated as non-attainment. These criteria pollutants are: Carbon Monoxide (CO); Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x); Reactive Organic Compounds (ROC); and Particulate Matter – Fugitive Dust (PM₁₀). In addition, landfill gas contains methane which is considered a greenhouse gas. This emission is mitigated by an existing gas collection/destruction system. Landfill gas is currently collected and destroyed in a flare system or used to power electrical generators. Emissions from the flare and generators include CO, NO_x, ROC and PM₁₀. Activities associated with both Phase I and Phase II of the proposed Master Plan would have the potential to result in generation of air emissions. Emissions could be associated with truck traffic, equipment operation, earth movement, landfill gas processing systems and employee traffic. Emissions associated with such activities and the relationship of projected emission levels to SCAQMD thresholds will be discussed in the EIR.

III d Air Quality (pollutant concentrations)

SCAQMD protocol utilizes localized CO concentrations to determine pollutant concentration potential. This criteria pollutant is the most likely to concentrate locally and cause health impacts, and is the only criteria pollutant for which an accepted methodology for calculating and assessing impacts of local concentrations has been developed. Activities associated with both Phase I and Phase II of the proposed Master Plan would have the potential to result in

(ENV-2001-____-EIR)

generation of CO emissions. CO emissions could be associated with truck traffic, equipment operation, landfill gas processing systems and employee traffic. Emissions associated with such activities and the relationship of projected CO concentrations to applicable state and federal CO standards will be discussed in the EIR.

III e Air Quality (odors)

Operation of a landfill typically generates odors as a result of decomposing refuse. Measures to reduce odors are presently required by the landfill's Solid Waste Facility Permit Nos. 19-AR-0004 (for Bradley East) and 19-AR-0008 and are already in place. These mitigation measures would apply to the continuation of landfill operations at currently permitted levels that would occur under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan. In addition, the existing landfill gas collection and processing system mitigates odors associated with landfill gas. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, odor generation could potentially be associated with the transfer station/MRF operation. Inclusion of misters and other standard design features in the transfer station/MRF building would mitigate potential impacts associated with odors. The potential for odor generation and associated mitigation measures will be discussed in the EIR.

IV BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

IV a Biological Resources (impacts on sensitive species)

The project site is already disturbed and has been used for landfill operations since 1959. No removal or modification of habitat would occur as a result of activities associated with either Phase I or Phase II of the proposed Master Plan. Therefore, no impact to sensitive species identified by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would occur.

IV b Biological Resources (impacts on riparian and sensitive habitats)

No riparian or other sensitive habitat areas are presently located on the project site. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not impact any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

IV c Biological Resources (impacts on wetlands)

The project site is an existing landfill that has been used for landfill operations since 1959 and does not contain any riparian or wetland habitats. The project site does not possess any characteristics of "wetlands" as defined in Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The Proposed Project would not affect any wetland habitat and would not require a Section 404 permit.

IV d Biological Resources (wildlife migration)

The project site is located in an industrialized area of Los Angeles and has served as a landfill since 1959. The site does not serve as a wildlife corridor and is not directly linked to areas with undisturbed habitat. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not disrupt an established wildlife corridor or interfere with a migratory pattern or impede the use of a native wildlife nursery site.

IV e Biological Resources (local policies or ordinances)

Los Angeles City Ordinance No. 153,478, Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, requires the protection of oak trees when property is developed within the City. All trees presently located on the project site have been planted as part of the site landscaping. No trees would be removed as part of the Proposed Project and no trees subject to the provisions of the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance would be affected by the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with any tree related policies protecting biological resources. No other local ordinances dealing with the preservation of biological resources would be applicable to the existing landfill site.

IV f Biological Resources (conflict with adopted conservation plans)

No approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans are applicable to the project site. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with the provisions of any established conservation plan.

V CULTURAL RESOURCES

V a Cultural Resources (historical resources)

A records search was conducted for the project site by the South Central Coastal Information Center on March 6, 2002. According to this records search, there are no properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places, California State Historic Resource Inventory, California Historical Landmarks or California Points of Historic Interest within one-half mile of the project site. The records search indicated that one City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument is located approximately one-half mile east of the project site (No. 172, Stonehurst Recreation Center Building). This monument is sufficiently distant from the project site that the Proposed Project would not have the potential to impact it. The Proposed Project would not have the potential to impact historical resources.

V b Cultural Resources (archaeological resources)

All earth movement required in order to bury refuse would occur in already disturbed areas within the existing landfill cap, which is located above the surrounding natural grade of the area. All soil used for cover operations is imported. Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, no change in existing operational procedures for landfill operations would occur. The proposed transfer station/MRF that would be developed under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan would be located within the existing landfill property, on the west side in a reclaimed sand and gravel mine. No new subsurface excavations would be required in undisturbed areas under either Phase I or Phase II of the proposed Master Plan. A records search was conducted for the project site by the South Central Coastal Information Center on March 6, 2002. According to this records search, no prehistoric or historic archaeological sites or isolates have been identified within one-half mile of the project site. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have the potential to result in the disturbance of archaeological resources and no impact would occur.

V c Cultural Resources (paleontological resources)

No unique geologic features are known to exist within the project site. Under the Proposed Project, any required earth movement would occur in areas that have already been disturbed during mining activities or previous landfill operations and would take place within the existing landfill cap, which is located above the surrounding natural grade of the area. Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, no change in existing operational procedures for landfill operations would occur. The proposed transfer station/MRF that would be developed under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan would be located within the existing landfill property, on the west side in a reclaimed sand and gravel mine. No new subsurface excavations would be required in undisturbed areas under either Phase I or Phase II of the proposed Master Plan. As such, the potential for recovering any unique paleontological resources is extremely limited. Therefore, no impacts to paleontological resources would occur as a result of the Proposed Project.

V d Cultural Resources (human remains)

The project site is located in an existing landfill. During Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, earth movement required to bury refuse would occur in areas that have already been disturbed during mining activities or previous landfill operations. Such activity would take place within the existing landfill cap, which is located above the surrounding natural grade of the area. The proposed transfer station/MRF that would be developed under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan would be located within the existing landfill property, on the west side in a reclaimed sand and gravel mine. No new subsurface excavations would be required in undisturbed areas under either Phase I or Phase II of the proposed Master Plan. The Proposed Project would not have the potential to encounter human remains.

VI GEOLOGY AND SOILS

VI a Geology and soils (exposure of people or structures to potential risks)

VI a 1 Geology and soils (fault rupture)

The project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Special Study zone; however, it is located in a Fault Rupture Study Area.³ Two faults are located in the vicinity of the landfill: the Tujunga segment of the San Fernando-Sierra Madre Fault and the Verdugo Fault. The Tujunga segment of the San Fernando-Sierra Madre Fault is an active fault located approximately 2.5 miles north of the site. The most recent activity reported along the Tujunga segment of the San Fernando-Sierra Madre Fault was the San Fernando (Sylmar) earthquake of Moment Magnitude 6.6, which occurred on February 9, 1971.

The Verdugo Fault trace was mapped by LeRoy Crandall and Associates in 1985 and 1986 on the southernmost portion of the property, immediately west of Well 4916C and west of Well 4916. The Verdugo Fault roughly parallels San Fernando Road and is not known to have been active in Holocene time.⁴ The most important characteristic of this fault is that it acts as a barrier to the southwesterly movement of groundwater in the site area.

Southern California is widely recognized as a seismically active region and is susceptible to periods of intense ground movement and surface fault rupture. The project site includes an existing landfill and is subject to the existing inherent hazards associated with strong seismic activity. Phase I of the proposed Master Plan would raise the maximum height of the landfill by 43 feet, prior to post-closure settlement. No new structures or facilities would be constructed. Phase II of the proposed Master Plan would convert the existing landfill operations into a transfer station/MRF operation. Construction of the transfer station/MRF and support buildings would be in accordance with all applicable regulations of the Building Code pertaining to seismic resistance. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault or hazardous fault zone.

VI a 2 Geology and soils (groundshaking)

Southern California is recognized as a seismically active area. Numerous damaging earthquakes have been recorded in southern California in historic times. These earthquakes result from tectonic forces that have been ongoing for millions of years. Earthquake activity tends to aggregate around the boundaries of the Earth's tectonic plates and southern California has been the location of a plate boundary for at least 200 million years.

³ *Los Angeles Planning Department Citywide Division, Environmental and Public Facilities Maps: Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zones and Fault Rupture Study Areas in the City of Los Angeles, September 1, 1996.*

⁴ *Report of Disposal Site Information, Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center, 1996.*

(ENV-2001-____-EIR)

The project site is located in the vicinity of the Tujunga segment of the San Fernando-Sierra Madre Fault and the Verdugo Fault. Phase I of the proposed Master Plan would result in continuation of the existing landfill operation and landfill closure activities and would not involve any new structures that would be affected by seismic groundshaking. Phase II of the proposed Master Plan would convert existing landfill operations into a transfer station/MRF operation on or before the landfill's closure date. Construction of the transfer station/MRF and support buildings would be in accordance with all applicable regulations and the Building Code pertaining to seismic resistance. Potential impacts from seismic ground shaking are present throughout Southern California and would be of comparable intensity at the project site as it would be for large parts of the City of Los Angeles and the region. Impacts associated with seismic groundshaking would be less than significant.

VI a 3 Geology and soils (seismic ground failure)

Soil liquefaction is a process whereby water-saturated, loosely consolidated, cohesionless sediments lose strength and subsequently fail due to the strong seismic shaking from earthquakes. The project site is not located within an identified liquefaction hazard area.⁵ The natural sands, gravel, and boulders below the base of the landfill are too dense and too coarse-grained for liquefaction. In addition, the water table at the site is too low to create any significant liquefaction potential in the natural materials (Rust 1993). Therefore, neither Phase I nor Phase II of the proposed Master Plan would expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects resulting from seismically induced ground failure or liquefaction.

VI a 4 Geology and soils (landslides)

According to the Los Angeles City Planning Maps, the project site is not located within an area that is prone to landslides. The existing landfill site is located within the northeast San Fernando Valley basin. With the exception of the landfill cap, which consists of a series of engineered slopes that are constructed to be resistant to landslide failure, the area immediately surrounding the project site consists of generally level topography, where risk of landslide is not present. However, the existing landfill site is located within one mile of an area located in the foothills of the Verdugo Mountains that contains a cluster of small shallow surficial landslides. These areas would have no effect on the existing landfill and immediately surrounding areas. Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, engineered slopes that are resistant to potential landslides would continue to be constructed until the landfill is closed. All earthmoving activities would take place within the existing landfill cap, which is located above the surrounding natural grade of the area. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, the proposed transfer station/MRF and support buildings would be located on level ground and not subject to impacts from landslides. No new subsurface excavations would be required as part

⁵ *Los Angeles Planning Department Citywide Division, Environmental and Public Facilities Maps: Areas Susceptible to Liquefaction in the City of Los Angeles, September 1, 1996.*

(ENV-2001-____-EIR)

of the Proposed Project. All soil used for cover operations is imported. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in impacts related to landslides.

VI b Geology and soils (erosion)

Operation of a landfill can expose large areas to the potential effects of soil erosion due to excavation in order to bury refuse. The existing landfill operates under two Solid Waste Facility Permits (19-AR-0004 and 19-AR-0008) which contain required measures to reduce the potential for erosion.

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, no change in the existing operating procedures would occur. No new sources of soil erosions are anticipated. Therefore, no impact to soil erosion is anticipated. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would be converted to a transfer station/MRF operation. No new soil erosion would be anticipated as a result of the operation of the transfer station/MRF.

Any potential impacts related to soil erosion from existing landfill operations will be mitigated to a level of insignificance by presently imposed mitigation measures which would continue to be applicable to the landfill in the event the Proposed Project is approved. These mitigation measures include:

- Periodic grading and watering of the haul roads.
- Applying a fine water spray on soil cover in work areas when atmospheric conditions might cause the formation of fugitive dust.
- Applying water and planting temporary vegetative cover on the intermediate soil cover where wind blown dust may be generated.
- Planting and maintaining a vegetative cover on completed landfill fill slopes.

VI c Geology and soils (unstable soils)

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, all earthmoving activities would take place within the limits of the existing landfill and would consist of engineered slopes that are designed for stability. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, the transfer station/MRF building and support building would be constructed within the existing landfill boundary. Grading activities to prepare the site for construction of these buildings would consist of excavation and recompaction of on-site soils that would be subject to a grading plan approved by the Department of Building and Safety in the course of its ministerial duties. The Proposed Project would not create unstable soil conditions or induce on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

VI d Geology and soils (expansive soils)

(ENV-2001-____-EIR)

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, all earthmoving activities would take place within the limits of the existing landfill over existing refuse. Native soils at the site of the proposed transfer station/MRF that would be constructed under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan consist of sand and gravel deposits. Existing on-site soils would be removed and recompacted in the course of site preparation for constructing the transfer station/MRF buildings. Grading and site preparation activities would be subject to a grading plan approved by the Department of Building and Safety in the course of its ministerial duties. There would be no impacts associated with expansive soils.

VI e Geology and soils (septic systems)

The administrative buildings at the project site are currently served by a wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment system operated by the City of Los Angeles. Therefore, no impacts related to septic or alternative wastewater disposal systems would occur.

VII HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

VII a Hazards (hazardous materials)

The project site is an existing Class III landfill that accepts for disposal non-hazardous solid wastes and inert solid wastes that require no special handling. This includes "garbage, trash, paper, rubbish, ashes, industrial wastes, demolition and construction wastes, abandoned vehicles and parts thereof, discarded home and industrial appliances, vegetable solid and semisolid wastes and other discarded solid and semi-solid wastes..."⁶ The disposal of regulated hazardous wastes and PCB waste is prohibited at Solid Waste(Class III) landfills under Federal, State and local laws. Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would continue. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, landfill operations would be converted to a transfer station/MRF operation that would also be limited to handling non-hazardous solid waste. Routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials would not occur under either Phase I or Phase II of the proposed Master Plan and impacts would be less than significant.

VII b Hazards (risk of upset)

As discussed above, the existing landfill is permitted to handle only non-hazardous wastes. As required by California Code of Regulations Title 14 and Title 22, Waste Management Recycling and Disposal Services of California, Inc., owner/operator of the Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center has implemented a program to detect and prevent the disposal of regulated hazardous wastes and PCB waste through a Load Checking Program. Occasionally small amounts of hazardous waste are found before they are disposed in the landfill. This

⁶ *Report of Disposal Site Information – Bradley Landfill and Recycling Center, 1996.*

usually constitutes attempted illegal disposal or abandonment of hazardous waste on the part of the original generator.

Hazardous materials which are discovered in the course of normal landfill operations are limited to small volumes. Hazardous materials discovered through load checks are removed from the landfill and are handled in accordance with existing local, state and federal regulatory requirements. The BLRC maintains contingency and emergency plans for the facility. Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing procedures would remain in effect. If hazardous materials are discovered during load checks while the disposal truck is still on-site, the materials are returned to the truck operator for proper disposal. If the disposal truck has left the site when hazardous materials are found, the materials are removed from the landfill and held on-site in a secure area until they can be removed by a licensed hazardous waste hauler to a proper disposal facility. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would be converted to a transfer station/MRF operation. A similar load checking program would be employed as part of the transfer station/MRF operation. The handling of hazardous materials under the proposed Master Plan and mitigation measures for ensuring safety of such materials will be addressed in the EIR.

VII c Hazards (hazardous materials in vicinity of school)

No schools are located within one-quarter mile of the project site. The nearest school is the Stonehurst Avenue Elementary School located approximately 1.1 miles southwest of the project site. Byrd Middle School is located approximately 2.2 miles west of the project site. The existing landfill does not emit hazardous emissions or accept hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste for disposal at the landfill. Small amounts of hazardous materials discovered in the course of landfill operations are removed from the landfill and handled in accordance with existing regulatory requirements. Because of the small volumes involved and established procedures for handling and securing such materials, they do not pose a substantial risk to surrounding areas. Potential impacts associated with hazardous materials in the vicinity of schools would be less than significant.

VII d Hazards (listed hazardous materials sites)

The Proposed Project does not, in its normal mission, handle hazardous waste or hazardous materials, except in small amounts as indicated above, and is not included on any list of such sites. No impact related to listed hazardous materials sites would occur.

VII e Hazards (public airport safety)

The nearest airport to the project site is the Whiteman Airport, a general aviation airport located approximately 2 miles north of the project site. Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport (BUR) is located approximately 4.8 miles south of the project site and the Van Nuys Airport is

(ENV-2001-____-EIR)

located approximately 12.8 miles southwest of the project site. No impacts associated with airport safety hazards would occur.

VII f Hazards (private airstrip safety)

No private airstrips are located in the vicinity of the project site. No impacts associated with private airstrips would occur.

VII g Hazards (emergency response plans)

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, current operations at the landfill would continue and no change to existing emergency response or emergency evacuation plans would be required. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, the existing landfill operations would be converted to a transfer station/MRF operation. Implementation of the transfer station/MRF operation would be subject to the provisions of existing emergency response and emergency evacuation plans that would be subject to the approval of the Los Angeles Fire Department in the course of its ministerial duties. Potential impacts associated with emergency access or emergency response would be less than significant.

VII h Hazards (wildland fires)

The project site is not located in an area prone to wildland fires.⁷ Therefore, the proposed Master Plan would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

VIII HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

VIII a Hydrology and water quality (water quality standards)

The existing landfill has been designed to meet the applicable design and construction criteria of Title 23 California Code of Regulations, Chapter 15 and Title 27, California Code of Regulations. All areas of Bradley West and West Extension are equipped with a liner and leachate collection and removal system. Leachate is removed from sumps and discharged to the sewer pursuant to the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation Industrial Waste Permit No. 430638. The storm drainage system on the project site was designed in compliance with the Waste Discharge Requirements Permit No. 91-017 issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. This storm drainage system has been constructed to accommodate the anticipated peak flow from a 100-year, 24-hour precipitation event.

⁷ *Los Angeles City Planning Department Citywide Division, Environmental and Public Facilities Maps: Selected Wildfire Hazard Areas, September 1, 1996.*

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, no changes to existing operations would occur and the landfill footprint would not change. No significant increase in storm flows to the existing storm drainage system would occur under Phase I of the Proposed Master Plan. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, the transfer station/MRF building and surrounding areas would include design measures to ensure that the operation does not provide a source of water contamination. These features will be discussed in the EIR.

VIII b Hydrology and water quality (groundwater supply)

Neither Phase I nor Phase II of the proposed Master Plan would include deep excavations that have the potential to intercept existing aquifers nor would the proposed Master Plan include construction that would interfere with groundwater recharge and thus affect groundwater supplies. Neither Phase I or Phase II of the proposed Master Plan would result in a substantial increase in water usage that would have the potential to deplete groundwater supplies. In addition, the existing liners would be capable of handling the additional weight of waste and leachate generation such that the proposed project would not affect groundwater quality and therefore interfere with groundwater supplies. No impacts related to groundwater supply would occur.

VIII c Hydrology and water quality (erosion/siltation)

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing operations would continue. Earthmoving activities are currently subject to mitigation measures that minimize erosion potential. These measures would continue to be applicable under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan. No alteration in drainage patterns would occur under Phase I and no impacts related to erosion would occur under Phase I. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, site preparation activity, including excavation and recompaction of on-site soils, associated with construction of the proposed transfer station/MRF building and support building could result in an increase in the potential for erosion, only during construction. Potential impacts and mitigation measures related to erosion will be discussed in the EIR.

VIII d Hydrology and water quality (alteration of drainage patterns)

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would continue. Drainage patterns would not change as a result of Phase I and runoff would continue to be handled by the existing drainage system at the landfill. Drainage rates could increase under Phase I as a result of a smaller flat area and increased slopes that would result from Phase I activities. This drainage would continue to be within the capacity of the existing landfill drainage system. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, construction of the transfer station/MRF building and support building, along with new paved roads and parking lots, would have the potential to change runoff volumes and drainage patterns at the transfer station/MRF building site. Potential changes to drainage patterns and proposed storm drainage infrastructure, along with other mitigation measures as required, will be discussed in the EIR.

VIII e Hydrology and water quality (runoff volumes)

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would continue. Runoff volume from the landfill would not change as a result of Phase I because no increase in drainage area would occur and runoff would continue to be handled by the existing drainage system. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, construction of the transfer station/MRF building and support building, along with new paved roads and parking lots, would have the potential to change runoff volumes in the area of the transfer station/MRF building site. Potential changes to drainage patterns and proposed storm drainage infrastructure, along with other mitigation measures as required, will be discussed in the EIR.

VIII f Hydrology and water quality (water quality)

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would continue. The quality of runoff from the landfill would not change as a result of Phase I and runoff would continue to be handled by the existing drainage system. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, introduction of new paved roads and parking lots, would have the potential to introduce new sources of vehicle-related water contaminants into runoff from the area surrounding the transfer station/MRF site. Potential changes to runoff water quality, and design features to ensure that water quality is not degraded, along with other mitigation measures as required, will be discussed in the EIR.

VIII g Hydrology and water quality (housing in flood hazard areas)

This question would apply to the proposed project only if it included construction of residential units. No housing is included in the Proposed Project and no impact would occur.

VIII h Hydrology and water quality (flood flows)

The currently adopted National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) map that includes the project site shows portions of the project site as being within the 100-year flood hazard zone. However, this map was prepared at a time when those parts of the project site were comprised of below-grade gravel pits. These areas have subsequently been filled as a result of the landfill operation and are presently filled to a higher elevation than the existing surrounding grade. Thus the portions of the project site that are identified on the NFIP map as being within the 100-year flood hazard zone are in reality no longer subject to flooding. Phase I of the proposed Master Plan would not involve construction of new structures. Phase II of the proposed Master Plan would not locate new structures in any area subject to flooding. No impacts related to flooding would occur.

VIII i Hydrology and water quality (flooding hazards)

The project site and surrounding areas are located in an identified inundation zone in the remote event of failure of the Hansen Dam. Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would continue. No new structures would be constructed that would expose people or structures to significant risk from flooding resulting from inundation. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, new transfer station/MRF support buildings would be constructed. Potential impacts associated with flooding hazards will be discussed in the EIR

VIII j Hydrology and water quality (seiche/tsunami/mudflow)

The project site is located approximately 16 miles from the ocean and is not located within a hillside area. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated as a result of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

IX LAND USE AND PLANNING

IX a Land use and planning (dividing an established community)

Under Phase I and Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, operations would continue within the existing boundaries of the BLRC. Neither Phase I nor Phase II of the proposed Master Plan would have the potential to physically divide an established community.

IX b Land use and planning (conflict with adopted plans and regulations)

The project site is an existing landfill and has been previously disturbed by gravel and sand mining activities and landfill operations. The project site is zoned as M2-1, M2-1G, M3-1G. Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would continue. The current operation operates under land use permits issued by the City of Los Angeles and is in conformance with all conditions established by the City of Los Angeles. Phase I of the proposed Master Plan would be consistent with adopted plans and regulations of the City. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan the existing landfill operation would be converted to a transfer station/MRF operation. The proposed transfer station/MRF operation would be consistent with the General Plan designation for the site (Industrial) and would be permitted under the City of Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code. No variance or Conditional Use Permit would be required for the transfer station/MRF or support buildings. No impacts related to conflict with applicable plans and regulations would occur. However, as required under CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, consistency of the Proposed Project with adopted plans and regulations will be discussed in the EIR.

IX c Land use and planning (conflict with conservation plans)

The project site is an existing landfill and has been used for landfill operations since 1959. The project site has also been used as a gravel and sand quarry. No natural habitat communities

(ENV-2001-____-EIR)

exist on the project site. No habitat conservation plans or natural conservation plans govern the project site. No impacts with respect to conservation plans would occur.

X MINERAL RESOURCES

X a Mineral resources (mineral resources)

No oil extraction activities have historically occurred or are presently conducted on the project site. The project site is located in a Mineral Resource Zone 2 Area (MRZ-2) and a Surface Mining District (G).⁸ Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, operations would continue within the existing landfill limits. Mineral extraction activities that are presently ongoing in the area of the landfill would not be affected. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, construction of the transfer station/MRF and support buildings would not affect ongoing mineral extraction activities in the area. Location of these facilities on a reclaimed sand and gravel pit would not represent conversion of existing or potential mineral extraction uses to another use. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not impact mineral resources.

X b Mineral resources (designated mineral resource recovery sites)

The project site is located in a Mineral Resource Zone 2 Area (MRZ-2) and a Surface Mining District (G).⁹ Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, operations would continue within the limits of the existing landfill. Mineral extraction activities that are presently ongoing in the area of the landfill would not be affected. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, construction of the transfer station/MRF and support buildings would occur on a reclaimed sand and gravel pit and would not represent conversion of existing or potential mineral extraction uses to another use. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not impact mineral resources.

XI NOISE

XI a Noise (exceedance of local standards)

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, landfill operations would continue at the current rate until not later than April, 2007. No future increase in the amount of refuse accepted or the number of vehicles entering/exiting the landfill would occur. Noise levels would not change substantially as a result of landfill operations occurring under Phase I. Phase I of the proposed

⁸ Los Angeles City Planning Department, Citywide Division, *Environmental and Public Facilities Maps: Areas Containing Significant Mineral Deposits in the City of Los Angeles and Oil Drilling & Surface Mining Supplemental Use Districts in the City of Los Angeles*, September 1, 1996.

⁹ Los Angeles City Planning Department, Citywide Division, *Environmental and Public Facilities Maps: Areas Containing Significant Mineral Deposits in the City of Los Angeles and Oil Drilling & Surface Mining Supplemental Use Districts in the City of Los Angeles*, September 1, 1996.

(ENV-2001-____-EIR)

Master Plan would also encompass activities associated with landfill closures including construction of a four-foot soil cap over all exposed landfill surfaces and planting of vegetative cover. Equipment associated with this activity would have the potential to change noise levels generated on-site. The potential effects of closure activities, as compared to existing landfill operations, with respect to exceedance of noise standards will be evaluated in the EIR. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, the number and types of trucks entering and exiting the site could potentially change and some potential new noise sources (transfer trucks, stationary equipment) could be introduced at a new location on the project site. The potential effects of the transfer station/MRF operation on noise levels will be discussed in the EIR.

XI b Noise (groundborne noise/vibration)

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would continue. No increase in the amount of refuse accepted or the number of vehicles entering/exiting the landfill would occur. Groundborne noise or vibration levels would not change substantially as a result of activities occurring under Phase I. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, the number and types of trucks entering and exiting the site could potentially change and some potential new sources of groundborne noise and vibration (transfer trucks, transfer equipment, stationary equipment) could be introduced at a new location on the project site. The potential effects of the transfer station/MRF operation on groundborne noise and vibration levels will be discussed in the EIR.

XI c Noise (ambient noise levels)

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, landfill operations would continue at the current rate until not later than April, 2007. No increase in the amount of refuse accepted or the number of vehicles entering/exiting the landfill would occur. Noise levels would not change substantially as a result of landfill operations occurring under Phase I. Phase I of the proposed Master Plan would also encompass activities associated with landfill closures including construction of a four-foot soil cap over all exposed landfill surfaces and planting of vegetative cover. Equipment associated with this activity would have the potential to change noise levels generated on-site. The potential effects of closure activities, as compared to existing landfill operations, on ambient noise levels will be evaluated in the EIR. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, the number and types of trucks entering and exiting the site could potentially change and some potential new noise sources (transfer trucks, stationary equipment) could be introduced at a new location on the project site. The potential effects of the transfer station/MRF operation on ambient noise levels will be discussed in the EIR.

XI d Noise (temporary noise)

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would continue. Phase I of the proposed Master Plan would also encompass activities associated with landfill closures including construction of a four-foot soil cap over all exposed landfill surfaces and planting of

(ENV-2001-____-EIR)

vegetative cover. Equipment associated with this activity would have the potential to change noise levels generated on-site. The potential effects of closure activities, as compared to existing landfill operations, will be evaluated in the EIR. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, site preparation and construction of the transfer station/MRF and support buildings could involve the use of construction equipment that could potentially increase the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity on a temporary basis. Potential noise impacts associated with construction of the Proposed Project will be discussed in the EIR.

XI e Noise (airport)

The nearest airport to the project site is the Whiteman Airport, a general aviation airport located approximately 2 miles north of the project site. The Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport (BUR) is located approximately 4.8 miles south of the project site and the Van Nuys Airport is located approximately 12.8 miles southwest of the project site. The project site is located outside of the noise contours of these two airports. Air traffic from Whiteman Airport is periodic and limited in scope. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

XI f Noise (private airstrip)

This question would apply to the Proposed Project only if it were located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. No such facilities are located in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

XII POPULATION AND HOUSING**XII a Population and housing (growth inducement)**

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would continue at their present rate. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, the existing landfill operation would be converted to a transfer station/MRF operation on or before the existing landfill's closing date. Neither Phase I nor Phase II of the Proposed Project includes any residential units and therefore would not result in a direct increase in permanent population growth in Los Angeles. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, on-site employment would increase by approximately 30 to 40 jobs. This level of employment growth would not induce substantial housing growth in the area. Moreover, the area surrounding the project site is urbanized and served by existing infrastructure. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not induce substantial population growth or generate the need to expand existing urban infrastructure. No impacts related to growth inducement would occur.

XII b Population and housing (housing displacement)

The project site does not contain any housing units and neither phase of the Proposed Project involves demolishing any housing units. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have an impact or require replacement housing.

XII c Population and housing (population displacement)

There are no housing units located on the project site and neither phase of the Proposed Project involves the demolition of any housing. No impacts related to population displacement would occur.

XIII PUBLIC SERVICES

XIII a Public services (fire protection)

The Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) provides emergency, medical, and fire protection services to the project area. The nearest Fire Station is located at 8943 Glenoaks Boulevard (approximately 1.5 miles north of the project site). Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would continue and no increase in demand for fire protection services would occur. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, the existing landfill operation would be converted to a transfer station/MRF operation. Under Phase II, the demand for LAFD's services would be similar to the existing demand. Therefore impacts related to fire protection services would be less than significant.

XIII b Public services (police protection)

The City of Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) provides police protection services in the project area. The project site has fences, walls, and gates to control unauthorized access to the site. A camera monitors and records gate and scale transactions 24-hours per day. Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would continue. No new demand for LAPD services would be associated with Phase I of the proposed Master Plan. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, the existing landfill operation would be converted to a transfer station/MRF operation, which would not generate new demand of LAPD services. Therefore impacts related to police protection services would be less than significant.

XIII c Public Services (schools)

As discussed above under Section XII, Population and Housing, neither Phase I nor Phase II of the Proposed Project would generate permanent population growth in Los Angeles. Further, the project would not generate substantial new employment on the site. The Proposed Project

(ENV-2001-____-EIR)

would not generate any additional demand for school facilities and, therefore, no impact on school services.

XIII d Public services (parks)

Neither Phase I nor Phase II of the Proposed Project would increase population or provide substantial new employment. Therefore, no impacts to parks would occur as a result of the Proposed Project.

XIII e Public services (other public facilities)

Neither Phase I nor Phase II of the Proposed Project would increase population or provide substantial new employment. Therefore, no impacts to other public facilities such as libraries would occur as a result of the Proposed Project.

XIV RECREATION

XIV a Recreation (park facilities)

Neither Phase I nor Phase II of the Proposed Project would result in substantial new employment or population growth. Thus, the Proposed Project would not create any additional demand for public park facilities.

XIV b Recreation (new or expanded park facilities)

No construction or expansion of park facilities would occur as a result of the Proposed Project. Therefore, no impacts to recreational facilities would occur.

XV TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

XV a Transportation and traffic (transportation system capacity)

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, landfill operations would continue to occur at current traffic volumes. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, changes in the number and types of trucks entering and leaving the landfill could result from conversion of the existing landfill operation to a transfer station/MRF operation. In addition, some traffic associated with landfill closure operations in Phase I could overlap with transfer station/MRF operations occurring under Phase II. Potentially significant transportation and traffic impacts will be discussed in the EIR.

XV b Transportation and traffic (congestion management plan)

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, landfill operations would continue to occur at current traffic volumes. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, changes in truck traffic could occur that could affect highways included within the Congestion Management Plan (CMP) for Los Angeles County. Potential impacts related to transportation and traffic will be discussed in the EIR.

XV c Transportation and traffic (air traffic)

Neither Phase I nor Phase II of the proposed Master Plan includes any aviation related uses. Therefore, this question is not applicable to the Proposed Project.

XV d Transportation and traffic (hazards)

Neither Phase I nor Phase II of the proposed Master Plan includes changes in roadway or intersection configurations or involves the use of incompatible uses (i.e., farm equipment). No impact would occur.

XV e Transportation and traffic (emergency access)

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, landfill operations would continue. No change in emergency access requirements would occur as a result of Phase I. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, new transfer station/MRF and support facilities would be constructed that would require the provision of emergency access. Emergency access design features will be discussed in the EIR.

XV f Transportation and traffic (parking)

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would continue. No new demand for parking would occur under Phase I. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, employment would increase by 30 to 40 jobs resulting in demand for new parking facilities on site. Provision of adequate facilities to address increased parking demand will be discussed in the EIR.

XV g Transportation and traffic (alternative transportation)

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would continue. No alternative transportation facilities would be affected by activities associated with Phase I. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, construction of new facilities would occur within the boundaries of the BLRC and would not affect any existing alternative transportation facilities. No impacts related to alternative transportation systems would occur.

XVI UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

XVI a Utilities (water quality standards)

The project site operates under three industrial waste water permits. Permit #W-416522 covers rinse water discharged from a truck wash. Permit numbers #W-471504 and #W450638 cover waste water generated by the landfill gas plant phase separator and leachate collection system, respectively. Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would continue. No new discharges to the sewer system would result from activities occurring under Phase I. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, leachate volumes from the landfill would gradually decrease and landfill gas condensate would continue to be processed by existing facilities. Potential new sources of industrial wastewater generation could be associated with the proposed transfer station/MRF operation, including water that comes in contact with waste and wash water. Potentially significant impacts related to industrial wastewater discharges and wastewater treatment requirements will be discussed in the EIR.

XVI b Utilities (water/wastewater treatment facilities)

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would continue and wastewater generation and water consumption would not change. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, wastewater discharge would not change substantially. Overall water consumption would decrease under Phase II because of reduced water usage for wetting down areas undergoing earth movement. Impacts on water and wastewater treatment facilities would be less than significant.

XVI c Utilities (stormwater drainage facilities)

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing operations would continue within the current landfill limits. Runoff volume from the landfill would not change as a result of Phase I and runoff would continue to be handled by the existing drainage system. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, construction of the transfer station/MRF building and support building, along with new paved roads and parking lots, would have the potential to change runoff volumes and rates in the area of the transfer station/MRF building site. Potential changes related to storm drainage infrastructure, along with other mitigation measures as required, will be discussed in the EIR.

XVI d Utilities (water supplies)

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would continue and water consumption would not change. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, water consumption would decrease because of reduced water usage for dust control during earth movement and landfill operations. Existing water supplies are sufficient to serve the Proposed Project and no new or expanded entitlements would be needed.

XVI e Utilities (wastewater treatment capacity)

Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would continue and wastewater generation would not change. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, wastewater generation would increase marginally because of a projected increase of 30 to 40 on-site jobs , along with increased generation of industrial wastewater (contact water, wash water). This increase would be offset by a gradual decrease in the volume of leachate from the landfill that is treated as industrial waste water. Existing wastewater treatment capacity would be sufficient to serve the project site under the Proposed Project. Impacts related to wastewater treatment capacity would be less than significant.

XVI f Utilities (landfill capacity)

The project site is an existing and operational landfill. Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would continue and the landfill would remain available to serve the need for regional disposal capacity. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, the facility would remain available to serve regional disposal needs by providing for the efficient transfer of solid waste as well as providing increased capabilities for the processing of recyclable materials. Solid waste would be transferred from the proposed transfer station to other Waste Management-owned landfills that have already been permitted, including Lancaster, Antelope Valley and El Sobrante. The Proposed Project would not adversely affect regional landfill capacity.

XVI g Utilities (solid waste regulations)

Landfill operations are conducted in accordance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations. As required by existing Solid Waste Facility permits, litter from the existing landfill is controlled by placing temporary, portable litter fences downwind from the working face. The fence, operational area and site in general are inspected daily and accumulated litter is removed. Litter found to have migrated offsite is immediately collected and returned to the disposal area. A permanent litter control fence has been installed along Glenoaks Boulevard at the northwest corner of the site. Under Phase I of the proposed Master Plan, existing landfill operations would continue and existing mitigation measures would remain in effect. Under Phase II of the proposed Master Plan, operations at the landfill site would continue to be in compliance with federal, state, and local regulations. No impacts related to solid waste regulations would occur.

XVII MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

XVII a Mandatory findings of significance (degrading environmental quality)

While the project will not remove or destroy wildlife habitat or have a significant impact on any wildlife species, the project has the potential to degrade the quality of the environment in a broader urban context. The project may result in environmental impacts in the form of: aesthetics, air quality, hazards & hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, noise, and transportation/traffic. As such, these issues will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

XVII b Mandatory findings of significance (cumulative impacts)

It has been determined that the project has the potential to result in adverse impacts upon the environment and an EIR is required. As mandated by CEQA, the project's cumulative impacts will be addressed within the scope of the EIR.

XVII c Mandatory findings of significance (adverse effects on human beings)

As determined above, the project has the potential to result in environmental impacts which could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. The project EIR will address the project's potential to create impacts in the following environmental issues areas: aesthetics, air quality, hazards & hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, noise, and transportation/traffic.